DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 916 SO 013 874

AUTHOR Higgins, Patricia J., Ed.; Selig, Ruth O., Ed.

TITLE Teaching Anthropology to Students and Teachers: Reaching a Wider Audience. Publication 82-1.

INSTITUTION Georgia Univ., Athens. Anthropology Curriculum Project.

PUB DATE 81
NOTE 84p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (Washington, DC, December 6, 1980).
AVAILABLE FROM Anthropology Curriculum Project, The University of Georgia, 107 Dudley Hall, Athens, GA 30602 ($3.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology; Case Studies; Educational History; Educational Innovation; Educational Trends; Higher Education; Secondary Education; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

These papers, presented at a 1980 American Anthropological Association seminar, address two topics: why the teaching of anthropology should be promoted, especially at the secondary level; and how anthropologists and educators might achieve this goal. Several of the papers have been substantially revised since the symposium. The papers are organized into three major sections. Part I deals with the history and status of anthropology teaching. Teacher training is the focus of the papers in Part II. Part III presents case studies in innovative teaching at the secondary and college levels. The publication concludes with a selected bibliography of resources on pre-collegiate anthropology. Bibliographies, books and articles, and periodicals are cited. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215916

TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY TO STUDENTS AND TEACHERS: REACHING A WIDER AUDIENCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. J. Rice

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PAPERS EDITED
BY
PATRICIA J. HIGGINS
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
COLLEGE AT PLATTSBURGH
AND
RUTH O. SELIG
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE

Symposium Sponsored by Committee Three
Council on Anthropology and Education
American Anthropological Association
Washington, D.C.
December 6, 1980

SP013874

Publication 82-1
Anthropology Curriculum Project
The University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
1981

ERRATA

TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY TO STUDENTS AND TEACHERS:
REACHING A WIDER AUDIENCE

On the cover and first page, Smithsonian Institute should properly be The Smithsonian Institution, of course. One error is bad enough but, since both of these pages were printed from the same plate, the result was two errors. Subsequent printings will show the correct title.

December 15th, 1981

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
Patricia J. Higgins

PART I. HISTORY AND STATUS OF ANTHROPOLOGY TEACHING

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM: PERSPECTIVES AND PROSPECTS 6
Ruth O. Selig

PRE-COLLEGIATE ANTHROPOLOGY: PROGRESS OR PERIL? 21
Thomas L. Dynneson

PART II. TEACHER TRAINING

LIMITS TO CHANGE: GETTING ANTHROPOLOGY INTO SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSROOMS 27
Patricia J. Higgins

ANTHROPOLOGY FOR TEACHERS 42
JoAnne Lanouette and Alison S. Brooks

PART III. CASE STUDIES IN INNOVATIVE TEACHING

TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL ANTHROPOLOGY 51
Richard P. Abell

NOTES ON HIGH SCHOOL FIELDWORK 56
Beatrice Spencer Kleppner

INNOVATION AND RESPONSE: PROJECT CREATIVE IN ANTHROPOLOGY AT AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY 60
Mario D. Zamora and Raquel M. German

INDIANS, SOLDIERS, REDNECKS, AND PRISONERS: TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE OUTREACH CENTERS 71
Dennis E. Shaw

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY: A BEGINNING GUIDE TO RESOURCES ON PRE-COLLEGIATE ANTHROPOLOGY 75
Ruth O. Selig

CONTRIBUTORS 79

FOREWORD

The Anthropology Curriculum Project, University of Georgia, is happy to make available to educators and anthropologists the Committee Three CAE publication, "Teaching Anthropology to Students and Teachers: Reaching a Wider Audience," edited by Patricia J. Higgins and Ruth O. Selig.

Since the first conceptualization of the Anthropology Curriculum Project in 1963, it has been concerned with reaching a wider audience. While other NSF and USOE projects disappeared with the cessation of federal funding, the Anthropology Curriculum Project has continued to exist as a forum for the exchange of ideas about the problems and prospects of teaching anthropology and to reissue the original teaching materials.

The problems of reaching pre-college students and teachers are manifold (Selig and Dynneson) although there are such bright prospects as the Anthropology for Teachers project in metro-Washington (Lanouette and Brooks) and creative examples of pre-college and college teaching (Part III).

Perhaps it is Higgins, however, who draws our attention to a fundamental issue--the perception of content as social studies by teachers and the perception of content as science by anthropologists. As a commentary, it is significant that Global Education is now one of the most popular SIGs (Special Interest Groups) of the National Council for the Social Studies. Much of the content of global education relates to anthropology. Yet the Anthropology SIG died unlamented and unnoticed at NCSS New Orleans in 1980.

Selig draws an effective contrast between the support given by psychologists to the teaching of pre-college psychology, and the lack of support given by anthropologists and the American Anthropological Association to the pre-college teaching of anthropology. But the main problem which affects the quality of all education may be much deeper--teaching special topics through facts and teaching science as organized knowledge, conceptually interrelated.

M.J. Rice
Anthropology Curriculum Project

INTRODUCTION

Patricia J. Higgins
SUNY, Plattsburgh

The papers in this volume were first prepared for presentation at the 1980 American Anthropological Association meetings in a symposium of the same name organized by Ruth O. Selig at the request of Committee 3 (Materials and Methods For Teaching Anthropology) of the Council for Anthropology and Education. The authors of these papers--whether university anthropologists, museum specialists, or classroom teachers--are all involved and concerned with spreading the anthropological perspective. Their efforts are based on the belief that anthropology has much to offer, and that its message should spread widely beyond the college classroom. In addition, they express a conviction that much can be done to improve the teaching of anthropology at all levels so that the discipline's humanistic, scientific, and practical implications will reach the largest possible audience.

Though several of the papers have been substantially revised since the symposium, the remarks of Alison S. Brooks, discussant at the symposium, still accurately highlight their major themes, and hence the themes of this volume. As Brooks noted, two principal questions are addressed: 1) why the teaching of anthropology should be promoted, especially at the secondary level; and 2) how anthropologists and educators might achieve this goal.

Several reasons, both altruistic and self-interested, are advanced to encourage anthropologists to reach out to a wider audience. There is an implicit belief that anthropology ought to enrich the curriculum before the college level, particularly for those students who will not attend college, so that the discipline can help improve the nation's ability to deal with ethnic differences internally and the cultural diversity encountered in the international sphere. The suggestion is also made that students whose interest has been sparked at the high school level are more likely to enroll in college courses, and that increasing public awareness of anthropology is likely to create increased opportunities for anthropologists in both research and applied fields.

The papers also suggest means by which anthropology might reach a wider audience. They explore efforts to use anthropology more effectively at the classroom and local level as well as considering initiatives which might be taken at higher administrative levels. A common theme is that schools and teachers must generate interest in anthropology as a necessary and relevant subject, not just an exotic one. There is a sense common to these papers that anthropology for students and teachers ought to use a topical rather than a survey approach, with the topics suited to the age and special interests of the audience addressed; and that the subject ought to be taught inductively, with opportunities for students to experience anthropology first hand through laboratory or field experiences. Finally, there is a sense that the anthropological perspective ought to pervade all social studies teaching--that the idea of cultural relativity and the importance of viewing American culture within a cross-cultural context should be promoted, whether through anthropology courses per se or within other courses with an anthropological component.

Administratively, the efforts of individual teachers and anthropologists in the schools must be supported by the incorporation of anthropology into the school curriculum as set by local and state administrators. In addition, anthropology ought to be made a more regular part of teacher preparation programs and of certification requirements and in-service training. Anthropologists can contribute to these efforts individually by working for change in their colleges, their communities, their states. In addition, there is a need for anthropologists to develop good classroom materials such as small module booklets on relevant topics as well as general high school texts. Collectively anthropologists ought to undertake organized and centralized efforts in support of pre-collegiate anthropology and other types of outreach efforts through national organizations such as the American Anthropological Association and the Council for Anthropology and Education. There is a great need for continuous support and sustained efforts at the national level.*

Thus, this volume is directed toward anthropologists and toward teachers and educators simultaneously, though the appeal to each group is somewhat different. We hope that anthropologists will be stimulated to give greater attention to education--not only in their own college classrooms, but also in elementary and secondary schools, in pre-service and in-service teacher training, and in various outreach and museum programs. This attention can take several forms: working with teachers, educators, and museum staff locally; preparing materials for classroom and/or outreach use; exerting pressure through professional and/or education organizations for appropriate changes in curriculum, program requirements, certification, pre-service and in-service teacher training.

---

*The preceding paragraphs summarize the oral remarks of Alison S. Brooks, discussant for the symposium "Teaching Anthropology to Teachers and Students: Reaching a Wider Audience," annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC, December 6, 1980.

To educators and teachers we say: anthropology does have something to offer the pre-college or non-college student; it can be taught at these levels; there are materials available; and there is a support network of interested teachers and anthropologists from which you can draw for ideas and sustenance.

The first two papers of the volume examine the history and status of anthropology in education, especially in pre-college education. Ruth Selig discusses the relationship between anthropology and education in the context of the historical development of anthropology as a discipline. She concludes that the failure of anthropologists to devote much attention to education, and especially to pre-college education, is a major reason why anthropology has not become more a part of the pre-college curriculum. Despite the interest and efforts of a few individuals, and the gradual shift in focus from the museum to the university, most anthropologists have continued to focus primarily on research. Selig argues that on the whole anthropologists have discouraged popularization of the field and that efforts to introduce anthropology into the pre-college curriculum have been associated with popularization and therefore devalued. Furthermore, to the extent that anthropologists have been involved in pre-college education, they have focused their attention on curriculum building to the neglect of dissemination and teacher training. Hence the results of their efforts have been limited. Selig urges that anthropologists undertake an organized campaign through their national organization to increase the recognition and use of anthropology at the pre-collegiate level, and she offers several specific suggestions to accomplish this goal.

Thomas Dynneson focuses more specifically on pre-collegiate anthropology and the progress that has been made in the field since the "new social studies" movement of the 1960s. He concludes that the curricular materials produced during that era have helped to make anthropology a recognized component of pre-collegiate education and to increase the use of anthropology at pre-college levels. He warns, however, that the cessation of the curriculum projects, the lack of attention to teacher preparation in anthropology, and the general movement away from a social science emphasis within social studies education may severly limit the future role of anthropology in pre-college education.

The second two papers describe efforts to provide secondary teachers with the background and skills needed to make greater use of anthropology in their teaching. Each was supported by the National Science Foundation through the Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program. This program provides financial support to colleges and universities to assist in the continuing education of secondary teachers in mathematics and the natural and social sciences. The specific objectives of the program are threefold: to improve teachers' knowledge of subject matter; to assist teachers in the identification and use of appropriate resources; and to develop and maintain communication and cooperation between college, university, and museum based scientists and classroom teachers.

(See "Guide for Preparation of Proposals and Project and Award Management" or "Directory of 1981-82 Academic Year Seminars," both available from the Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550.) It is hoped that one result of the present volume might be to encourage other anthropologists to submit proposals to NSF or other funding agencies for similar programs.

Patricia Higgins describes a project initiated at SUNY Plattsburgh to encourage and assist secondary social studies teachers to make greater use of anthropology in the teaching of general social studies. She and her colleagues found that the location of their campus in a small city in sparsely populated northern New York posed special restrictions and problems, especially in the recruitment of teachers to participate in their summer workshops. Two other problems encountered in implementing the workshops--the lack of commitment on the part of some of the teachers to a scientific orientation for social studies and the reluctance of many to experiment with inductive teaching strategies--are discussed in the context of recent studies of social science education and from the perspective of the anthropologist as ethnographer of her own culture.

JoAnne Lanouette and Alison Brooks describe the rationale, organization, and results of a joint university-museum program developed by anthropologists at George Washington University and The Smithsonian Institution for secondary teachers in the Washington, DC area. The core of the program is a topically organized academic year course taught in three different counties which draws upon the rich resources of George Washington University, The Smithsonian, and other cultural institutions in the metropolitan area. Ties are maintained and benefits extended beyond the course participants through a Teachers' Anthropology Resource Center, Evening Seminars, and a newsletter, Anthro-Notes. In contrast to the Plattsburgh program, the Washington program has had consistently successful recruitment efforts. The program has entered its fourth year without exhausting the supply of interested and eligible applicants. Like the Plattsburgh program, the Washington effort encourages and assists teachers to use anthropology in varied social and natural science courses by focusing on both practical teaching strategies and solid academic content.

Each of the remaining papers is a case study of innovative teaching of anthropology. Richard Abell describes his approach to teaching anthropology to seniors at a Maryland public high school. Abell focuses on several key features that he feels should animate a high school anthropology course. His experiences and insight should be useful to both secondary teachers planning or teaching anthropology courses and to anthropologists seeking to assist in these endeavors. Beatrice Kleppner offers valuable advice on organizing field experiences for high school students. Such experiences, she argues, must have a solid academic base and intellectual focus, even though the opportunity for field experience may come about quite by chance; she also warns that all involved must be prepared to face the ethical problems that may develop. Despite the many problems involved, a carefully thought out field experience can be ex-

citing and intellectually rewarding for students and teachers alike.

The final two papers are case studies in college teaching, each with an unusual feature. Mario Zamora and Raquel German describe a project carried out at The College of William and Mary designed to involve introductory anthropology students more intensely in the subject and to encourage the development of closer contact between students and between students and professor. In addition, the authors provide the results of a student evaluation of the experiment which are now being used to design improvements and refinements of the project. Dennis Shaw describes his experiences in teaching introductory anthropology through an outreach program to four unusual groups of students: reservation Indians; Air Force personnel and their dependents; rural southerners; and prisoners. While individual representatives of any of these groups might be found in the ordinary college classroom, rarely does the instructor face a class in which each is the typical student. Classes made up entirely of such constituents require the teacher to modify content and approach to meet the needs of the audience.

We hope these papers will provide a useful source of ideas to those already involved in similar efforts and a source of encouragement and stimulation to those who are not. We conclude the volume with a selected bibliography of sources on the teaching of anthropology, especially precollegiate anthropology. The bibliography provides additional resources for teachers as well as an introduction to the wider body of literature that already exists on this growing area of interest within the subdiscipline of Anthropology and Education.

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM: PERSPECTIVES AND PROSPECTS

Ruth O. Selig
Smithsonian Institution

As psychology and economics continue to increase their visibility in the secondary school classroom, anthropologists might ask, why hasn't anthropology become more a part of the pre-college curriculum? Part of the answer seems obvious. Psychology, economics, and sociology all have familiar career paths, each with a practical application which high school students grasp. Anthropology cannot compete with traditional subjects like history which students must take, or other social sciences like psychology which students want to study.

Part of the answer may also lie in the history and nature of the anthropology profession's involvement with anthropology teaching. From its beginnings, anthropology has been primarily a research profession. It has been a teaching profession as well, but almost exclusively at the university level. Showing little interest in pre-college anthropology, anthropologists have placed virtually no effort into its expansion.

This paper traces the anthropology profession's involvement with teaching and education throughout the twentieth century and explores several reasons for the scant attention given to pre-collegiate anthropology. Examination of the efforts anthropologists have made in this area, both individually and collectively, and comparison with the pre-collegiate educational activities of other social scientists, and in particular psychologists, suggest several potentially fruitful lines of action for the future.

Anthropology and Education: From Museum to University

In 1904 Edgar Lee Hewett published an article "Anthropology and Education" lamenting the state of the "anthropological science for which few could agree on basic definitions, for which there were no good textbooks, no treasury of folklore..." and this in a subject which "should enrich the course of study of every public school in the land" (1904:575). Hewett called for a solution, urging a clearer definition of the field and the writing of books to make anthropology accessible to teachers and students. He suggested that professional educators and anthropologists meet to work out a plan of action. Hewett's advice went largely unheeded, and little was done about encouraging anthropology teaching in schools until the 1960s.

In its beginnings, anthropology was not a teaching endeavor. The discipline grew originally from museum research and publication. The World's Fair of 1893, organized by Frederick Putnam and his assistant Franz Boas at the Field Museum, serves as a reminder that this was the golden age of museum anthropology. Before 1916 there was some anthropology taught in universities, but the statistics are misleading because several departments began which later petered out. By 1920 Clark Wissler could still state that anthropology had not been a source to which the teaching profession or any other profession looked to for guidance: "even today the number of our universities and colleges maintaining strong departments can be counted on the fingers of one hand" (Wissler 1920:6).

The transition from museum to university anthropology tells a fascinating tale, but one which cannot be explored in depth in this paper. It is an important transition to note, however, for around World War I, under the influence of Franz Boas and his students, anthropology began to flourish within universities where teaching is part and parcel of life. Boas and his students had been drawn to the university, however, not by the opportunity to teach, but by the opportunity to pursue scholarly research without the bureaucratic and administrative demands and impediments found in the museum world. The university held more freedom and opportunity, or so it was thought.

Nevertheless, in their new university niche, the teaching of young scholars became a concern for professional anthropologists, and the leaders of the profession naturally began to think about the methods and materials of anthropology teaching. In 1916 Boas called a symposium of 18 anthropologists at Columbia University to discuss the objects and methods of anthropology teaching. He meant, of course, anthropology teaching in universities and colleges, not in schools. Boas was politic about his meeting and invited a number of his old friends from The Smithsonian: Frederick W. Hodge, William Holmes, Walter Hough, and the physical anthropologist Ales Hrdlička. It must have been an interesting symposium with older museum scholars and their younger university colleagues, including Alfred Kroeber, Clark Wissler, Alfred Tozzer, and Robert Lowie. The group decided to prepare and circulate papers including one by Kroeber on teaching the introductory course, one on the relationship of undergraduate to graduate teaching, and another on teaching anthropology to non-anthropologists, as well as a couple of papers on the relationship of museums and universities. Alfred Tozzer from Harvard, where a close relationahip with the Peabody Museum had been established, presented a paper on the role of museums in teaching, Reminding us that 1916 was still the heyday of museum anthropology, Tozzer wrote: "an anthropology museum is a necessary adjunct to adequate instruction in anthropology...the teaching of most branches of anthropology has its beginning and its end in a museum and the closer the coordination between the teaching and the museum the more successful the results" (cited by Darnell 1969:257).

One wonders after reading Tozzer why anthropology did not grow more within this university/museum context. Perhaps Regna Darnell is correct, that gradually the seemingly inherent conflicts of museum science came to the forefront" (1969:194-195), including the incompatibility of research with popular education and the disagreements scientists could have with

patrons, administrators, and bureaucrats over research priorities. As Darnell concludes, the "cooperation between museums and universities which had seemed to provide the best of both worlds around the turn of the century gave way to a primarily academic commitment on the part of many anthropologists, particularly Boas and his students, by 1920" (1969:195).

So it was within the academic setting that Boas took the lead in turning the profession's attention to teaching. The 1916 symposium was significant, for it expressed an assurance and optimism about the discipline itself; "the existence of academic programs was taken for granted, the questions being asked were one of scope, aim, and additional institutional affiliation" (Darnell 1969:258). The motivation behind Boas' leadership is less clear, for he did not particularly like teaching. But he saw the need for training others to teach, if for no other reason than to relieve the older 'masters' to pursue research, since the demand for university teaching was growing apace. Even museum anthropologists became involved in teaching, as did Otis Mason from The Smithsonian's National Museum who taught at nearby Columbian College (later George Washington University). At the National Museum, Ales Hrdlička worked for the establishment of a teaching institution at The Smithsonian; Harvard was emerging as a center of archeology, and Columbia a center of ethnology and linguistics, but nowhere was there a center of solid physical anthropology except at the National Museum. Hrdlička's dream of a university on the Potomac was to come to nought.

Other scientific institutions also gave increased attention to the question of teaching anthropology. The American Association for the Advancement of Science had established a committee on anthropology teaching in 1899 chaired by W.J. McGee from the Bureau of American Ethnology. In 1916 this committee was chaired by Boas--a fitting symbol of the passing of the mantle. By 1917 the AAAS Committee on the Teaching of Anthropology in the United States was made permanent and was directed to make reports to the Council annually. At this point the committee looked different--all university people, without a museum representative among them.

The permanent committee's initial report to the council focused on the value of anthropology. Anticipating the viewpoint of applied anthropologists a half century later, the committee reported that "the importance of anthropology training for the social worker, the physician in charge of public health, the teacher, the Census administrator, the Colonial officer, and the legislator is not yet sufficiently understood" (Boas 1919:43). Anthropology had a service to perform, not only to train future anthropologists but to broaden the outlook of those pursuing other careers. The report designated various areas of anthropology to be taught along with the methods and materials required. The latter included: a laboratory to teach biological anthropology; museum specimens to illustrate ethnology; and an opportunity" for observing children among various social groups of our own communities as well as primitive societies as preparation for students carrying on independent research work in social groups" (Boas 1919:48). The last suggestion was unusual, but perhaps no surprise from Boas, whose students contributed so much to the field of childhood and society.

In the 1920s teaching anthropology became a central commitment for the discipline, and Edgar Hewett's plea for general works and a clearer definition of the field became a reality. General books by Boas, Sapir, Lowie, Wissler, and Kroeber provided intellectual synthesis but also textbooks for the university classroom. In 1920 the first classroom oriented collection of readings, The Sourcebook in Anthropology, was compiled by Berkeley's Kroeber and Waterman. The increased number of courses and departments provides further evidence of anthropology's growth within the university curriculum. In 1901 there were approximately thirty courses, by 1920 close to fifty. Only a few leading colleges such as Johns Hopkins had no anthropology, and many smaller colleges and state universities had added courses. Nonetheless, there were many more courses than departments, those courses often being found in other departments such as sociology, biology, or classical archeology.

Even so, the emphasis within the discipline remained on research and the training of a new generation of researchers. Berkeley was perhaps an exception due to its nature as a large state institution, and to Kroeber's presence. Kroeber, for example, felt the obligation to teach "school teachers in the Indian service, missionaries, and others who might put the knowledge gained to a practical purpose" (Darnell 1969:228).

Anthropology in Pre-College Education: Beginnings and Curriculum Building

Anthropology had made itself felt within the university curriculum, but virtually no one placed any importance on encouraging teachers to incorporate anthropology into the elementary or secondary classroom. Only a few isolated individuals like Edgar Lee Hewett and Margaret Mead felt that anthropology had a role to play in sensitizing teachers and students to a multi-cultural world.

Unfortunately, Edgar Lee Hewett was himself a controversial figure. As Curtis Hinsley recently pointed out, Hewett was viewed by his university colleagues as an "overt popularizer", or one who drew "suspicion if not outright hostility from those anxious to uphold professional standards and to fix clear boundaries between professional and public" (1980:7). Hewett, a former teacher, school superintendent, and president of New Mexico Normal University (1898-1903), became Director of the School of American Archeology and Director of the Museum of New Mexico at Santa Fe. He was seen by many, according to a 1910 letter written by Harvard's Alfred Tozzer, as overly ambitious, politic, and self-aggrandizing. Tozzer wrote:

> As for Hewett's standing among the American archeologists I can say, I think, with truth that with the exception of certain people connected with the Bureau of Ethnology and the Smithsonian at Washington together with personal friends in the west there is not a person connected with a scientific institution in the country which is doing work in American anthropology who approves of Hewett's work [cited by Hinsley 1980:9].

Tozzer is particularly vitriolic in his attack on Hewett. He cites most of the leading university anthropologists of the day as standing against this scientist who envisioned the wider use and application of anthropology both within the public school curriculum and as a general guide to government workers, Indian service personnel, and others working with non-Western cultures.

Unfortunately for the future of anthropology, most of its pioneers were unable to see the value of "popular anthropology", or even the value of a simplified anthropology for school students. Whereas the other social sciences (sociology, psychology, and economics) had a more 'applied' aspect and reached out for public understanding, anthropologists remained aloof, suspicious of those like Hewett and Margaret Mead who believed that the public should benefit from the field. The majority of anthropologists stood for rigorous scholarship which they thought threatened by overt popularizers.

Given this orientation, it is not surprising that until the 1950s there was very little anthropology teaching in the schools. Few anthropologists had thought of the idea and almost none were writing books suitable for the pre-college classroom. According to Thomas Dynneson, "it is difficult to pinpoint exactly when anthropology first entered the curriculum, but it is clear that this did not occur until the latter part of the forties" (1975:4). World War II focused the country's attention on non-Western peoples, and this spotlight may account for the first attempts by isolated teachers to incorporate anthropological concepts and materials into the social studies curriculum. In the 1950s the first descriptions of secondary school anthropology courses began to appear in education journals. There was some, but very little, anthropology in the schools. In fact, until 1960 there were probably less than fifty individual courses in secondary schools, though some teachers were borrowing concepts and materials from anthropology to 'enrich' their social studies and science courses. In 1958 there was still not a single state listing anthropology as an option for teacher certification.

Malcolm Collier in The Encyclopedia of Education summarized the state of anthropology in the pre-college curriculum in 1960:

> In 1960 it would have been possible to report on every secondary school course in the United States labeled anthropology or drawing extensively on anthropological ideas and materials...Of the 35 such courses about which information was available, 14 were taught in private schools, 21 in public schools...All of these teachers prepared their own course outlines and devised and supplied their own materials. They drew heavily on a few paperbacks and on selected journal articles, most of which had been written for adults. They were neither subsidized nor encouraged by the federal government, by the textbook publishers, or even by the schools, which stood to gain the most by these efforts.... [cited by Dynneson 1975:5].

The 1960s witnessed great changes in American society. As during the 1930s and 1940s, the notion that anthropology may have a practical use in helping to combat a host of societal ills (racism, the aftermath of colonialism, the threat of war) began to appear in print. University professors and secondary school teachers alike perceived a need for greater understanding of varied peoples and cultures as they tried to help their students understand an increasingly complex, multi-cultural world. Anthropology grew as a discipline at the university level through the increased numbers of departments, undergraduate majors, and graduate degrees. And anthropology began to enter the pre-college classroom as well. For the first time in the profession's history, professional anthropologists became involved with teachers--through curriculum projects and teacher training institutes. In addition, for the first time, anthropology was listed in some states as an option for the certification of teachers.

The upsurge of interest in secondary school anthropology rested heavily on support from the federal government. In the post-sputnik era, Congress poured millions of dollars into an effort to improve science education in America, primarily in mathematics and natural science, but by the mid-1960s into the social sciences as well. Anthropologists were quick to board the bandwagon. In 1965 the American Anthropological Association called for a symposium on Anthropology and Education to focus on the interest of anthropologists in formal education in general, and on secondary and elementary education specifically.

Like the Boas symposium of 1916, the 1965 symposium reflected optimism and assurance within the discipline. Lawrence Lindquist gave some opening remarks revealing this context of optimism--a context easy to forget in the 1980s:

> The profession of anthropology has succeeded in making its importance known in many areas. It has enlarged its vision, probed its specialties, captured masses of student devotees, become a household word, and developed an 'holistic' approach invaluable to the study of man [1968:1].

Lindquist went on to explain that teaching and learning--the transmission of culture patterns--would always be a part of human life. Within American society there would always be manipulation of the education process. Most academic disciplines were becoming involved in curriculum building for elementary and secondary schools, each committed to the idea that "their particular discipline best can serve as a kind of focal point in the school" (Lindquist 1968:2).

Solon Kimball, a leading spokesman in Anthropology and Education, also spoke at the 1965 symposium. Kimball noted that the sense of progress was encouraging but that much needed to be done. He likened the goal of anthropology's "penetration of the educational enterprise" to a "basic problem of innovation faced by all applied anthropologists--that is, the problem of introducing innovation, which could be accomplished only as existing patterns of behavior and organization were understood and altered where necessary" (Kimball 1968:5). Kimball stressed that curriculum was only one necessary

problem to attack. Anthropologists had to be as concerned with the preparation of teachers as with the content of curriculum.

The major focus of the symposium, however, was on curriculum. Unfortunately, it was also on curriculum that the American Anthropological Association focussed its efforts in the 1960s. Part of the responsibility for this emphasis on curriculum rests with the National Science Foundation. For as NSF itself stated in a recent report:

> The foundation did (in the 1960s) what came naturally to it, namely supporting the efforts of outstanding university scientists to develop new science and mathematics courses--new in content, conception, and design. Many such scientists became involved--turning their attention from the lab to the school room and the curriculum improvement effort was underway [Rutherford 1979:v].

NSF monies funded several major projects which were anthropologically oriented and which involved professional anthropologists in their development.

The American Anthropological Association established the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project which produced Patterns in Human History under the leadership of anthropologist Malcolm Collier. The curriculum was a year long multi-media program geared for 9th through 12th graders. Written by a combined team of anthropologists and teachers, it was tested, revised, and commercially published. Collier described the goals: "The aim is to help students think systematically about man's nature, his many societies, the whole career of his species." The program was to "democratize a social scientific understanding of man" through its treatment of the origin of man, simple hunting gathering societies, the transition to agriculture and urban life, and finally the modernization of traditional society (Collier and Dethlefsen 1968:12).

In Cambridge, Massachusetts, another project got underway through the federally funded Education Development Corporation, Man: A Course of Study, a year long program for elementary school students developed by biologists, anthropologists, and primatologists. MACOS was at first highly acclaimed and widely distributed, then much maligned and controversial as it became embroiled in political battles over the course's relativistic teachings. Another curriculum project including anthropology, the High School Geography Project, received funding under the Office of Education, and reached the publication stage of development, with materials still available and utilized in schools. Finally, the University of Georgia received federal funding for an anthropology curriculum program aimed at elementary students. The Georgia project was heavily weighted toward clear definitional learning by students, hoping that through learning terms the concepts would be internalized. The materials were never published in final form, and the project ceased to be funded as a curriculum development project by the early 1970s. The University of Georgia, however, through Marion Rice's leadership in Social Studies Education, continued to show strong interest in Anthropology and Education, and supported publication in the field of pre-collegiate anthropology, including

such books as Thomas Dynneson's Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials.

What were the results of the federal government's involvement in anthropology curriculum building? The National Science Foundation recently commissioned reports on the status of science education from 1955 to 1975. The 2,000 pages of report are fascinating, but discouraging (National Science Foundation 1978). The conclusions can be summarized:

1) The 1960s was a kind of "golden age of science education." The 'new social studies' was part of that effort, with 1967 the peak year when 75 projects were funded by various organizations.

2) The 'new social studies' curricula were marked by several characteristics: an emphasis on content, up-to-date research, in-depth coverage, and a cross cultural perspective; an inductive methodology using inquiry and media materials; development by a team of professional scientists and teachers; and materials geared for highly motivated students.

3) The impetus for development had slowed by the mid-1970s with the perception that the job had been done, that criticism was mounting (MACOS), that enough money had been spent, and that problems with the whole effort were increasingly apparent.

4) The actual use of the new materials was very small, though they were commercially available. A national survey by NSF found that only between 10 and 25% of the teachers were using materials from even one of the federally funded programs. As the National Council for the Social Studies concluded, "despite a fair amount of funding for curriculum development...one experience the social studies student is not likely to have is interaction with curriculum materials produced by federally funded projects, especially those funded by NSF."

5) There was no systematic research on indirect influence, but several surveys were undertaken of textbooks in use which did show indirect influence particularly in geography and world history texts (Shaver, Davis, and Helburn 1979:5-6).

Indirect influence there undoubtedly has been, for example in writings on ethnic minorities and Native Americans, but the question remains: Why were the materials not more widely used? The NSF Report offers some answers. There was a lack of 'fit' between the new materials and existing curriculum and methods of teaching. The materials were too academic and elitist. There was not enough training in the use of the materials, or in the content behind the materials. Finally, there was a general lack of awareness of the materials. In short, the exclusive emphasis on curriculum, without enough attention to dissemination and to teacher training, had been misguided.

Anthropologists should have known better. Innovation never comes easily, and one must know the local scene thoroughly before trying to exert change.

Lindquist and Kimball foresaw the problem in 1965 and issued warnings, but they went largely unheeded. Despite the curriculum development effort of the 1960s and the introduction of anthropology courses and units in some secondary and elementary schools, the discipline was not widely accepted or taught at the pre-college level, particularly as a separate subject.

By 1970 NSF was beginning to withdraw funds from the curriculum projects. NSF turned instead to teacher training, first with a series of summer workshops and then in 1977 with a Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program, designed to upgrade science education by bringing scientists into direct training contact with teachers.

The decision of NSF to turn to teacher preparation appears to be a sound one, particularly for anthropology. A teacher survey undertaken by Rice in 1976 concluded that involvement in anthropology teaching was related to preparation in anthropology (Rice 1977). Rice found that if teachers had courses in anthropology they were likely to teach the subject. He urged that all prospective social studies teachers be required to have at least one course in anthropology. Of course, this is not the case in most teacher education programs, and, unfortunately, few anthropologists have taken advantage of the NSF Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program. There have been only four or five anthropology projects funded under this program, with few submitted for consideration.

Anthropology and Education: Research or Application?

Again, the question, why haven't more professional anthropologists taken an interest in pre-collegiate anthropology? Part of the reason may lie in the continued dichotomy between research and teaching, a dichotomy reproduced within the subfield of anthropology and education. Here the dichotomy is particularly inimicable to the growth of pre-college anthropology, since it is within anthropology and education that a push for pre-college anthropology might naturally grow.

Though a distinct subfield of Anthropology and Education emerged only in the last decade, it has always existed as at least a minor concern within Anthropology. Since anthropologists study culture, they have always been interested in the process whereby an individual learns his own culture--education, or more broadly, enculturation.

During the 19th and early 20th century, however, anthropology gave little attention to enculturation, or even to the human life cycle. Research focused on technology and material cutlure, on linguistics, social organization, and religion. Within religious studies there was some interest in the ceremonies marking life cycle, but primarily the orientation of anthropology was evolutionary. Few anthropologists concerned themselves with cultural transmission or with socialization.

There was, however, at least one outspoken exception, and it is again Edgar Lee Hewett. Hewett combined in his interests both the research and applied sides of Anthropology and Education, and his work illustrates well

these two aspects which have always existed within this subfield. Hewett was emphatic on the ways which anthropologists could learn from studying cultural transmission in primitive societies, and then the ways those insights could be utilized to train teachers and build curriculum for American students.

Reacting to the recent acquisition of the Philippines, Hewett pleaded that the U.S. government work with the Bureau of American Ethnology so that educational policy for the Philippines would be based on an understanding of the people themselves. Hewett wrote: "Let us not inaugurate another century of dishonor by malpractice on another alien race. It is hardly the time to put the Filipinos to school with us. Let us go to school with them for awhile"(1905:14). Hewett proposed that we first study their social order, their religious beliefs, their ethnic mind--in short, that we study their system of enculturation before imposing our system on them. Hewett proposed an extension of the Bureau of American Ethnology and the establishment of a Bureau of Education "so that our educational policy for primitive races be based on knowledge of their racial mind and character" (1905:16).

Hewett, however, was not a major researcher in education or in enculturation, and it was not until the 1930s and 1940s that such studies were first made by anthropologists like Margaret Mead and Ralph Linton. Using theory largely borrowed from psychoanalysis, they were interested in the effect that early childhood learning had on both personality and cultural values. They did much to focus the attention of anthropologists on education, or enculturation and cultural transmission. It is interesting to note that Mead, like Hewett, believed that anthropology's insights had much to contribute to American education, and herself spoke often in support of that view as well as producing materials specifically written for the precollege student. Social anthropologists working in Africa in the 1940s and 1950s also produced studies bearing on the informal processes of cultural transmission.

In the 1960s, there emerged a new kind of educational ethnography as urban schools were studied using the methodology of participant observation. Upheavals in American society brought ethnic and racial subgroups within our society to the forefront of attention, as it did the schools which were expected to foster their acculturation and assimilation. At the same time, anthropologists realized that earlier models of enculturation were too limited, whether they focused on early childhood or the rites of passage. Thus one sees in the literature a searching for new models and analyses, and an interest in cognitive or interpersonal approaches using network analysis, systems theory, or cognitive/language theories.

Through the 1960s a group of anthropologists began to apply these approaches to educational institutions, especially schools. An emerging research field crystallized--anthropology and education--as the study of formal and informal education, including some learning but all teaching, formal and informal (Burnett 1975:5). The concept of cultural transmission emerged as a central idea, as researchers sought to carve out their field of research from its overlap with the fields of psychological anthropology, linguistics, and comparative education. Few of this new generation of

anthropologists of education, however, combined research and applied interests to the extent that Hewett, Mead, and several other of their forebearers had.

In 1968 the Council on Anthropology and Education was formed, bringing together a diverse group of anthropologists and a few educators. Most were interested in research on cultural transmission cross-culturally. The Council's newsletter, which originally had a section devoted to the teaching of anthropology, had become a journal by the end of the 1970s and almost exclusively a forum for research papers and reports. The Council's Standing Committees then numbered nine, and only one was concerned with anthropology teaching, collegiate or pre-collegiate.

National Support for Pre-College Anthropology: A Comparison with Psychology

The 1960s witnessed a limited push within the American Anthropological Association for pre-college programs, and some curriculum development and teacher training followed. The efforts, however, had limited impact. Further, they grew from national efforts and funding more than from any internal developments within anthropology. When the national efforts in science education withered, the push within the AAA quickly collapsed, and virtually no institutional support has been given to pre-collegiate anthropology since.

Other social sciences better capitalized on the momentum of the 1960s. For example, the American Psychological Association pushed in the 60's not just for new curriculum materials, but for teacher preparation and teacher certification as well (Lowman 1980). The APA appointed a taskforce, a Committee on Psychology in the Secondary Schools, and proceeded to produce a variety of materials useful to teachers:sourcebooks, listings of textbooks; guidelines for introducing new courses into the curriculum; guidelines for teacher certification to teach psychology; and a national newsletter, "High School Psychology Teacher". At the national level, the American Psychological Association added a full time staff member to concentrate on pre-college psychology and provided a mechanism for teachers to join the APA as high school affiliates.

The results have been impressive. The taskforce became an ad hoc committee, in continual existence for over twenty years. This committee of six professionals meets twice yearly to approve and rework materials produced by staff working in Washington. Today, three staff members at APA work full time on high school/undergraduate education. Ongoing secondary programs include producing materials mentioned above; a careful monitoring of certification requirements for every state; a careful tracking since 1975 of social studies (sociology, anthropology, psychology) actually taught at the secondary level; and development of inservice teacher training guidelines. Today the "High School Psychology Teacher" newsletter goes to 1400 teachers who subscribe to the APA for this service, and high school affiliates number 850--in an organization which is primarily oriented to Ph.D.'s! It is not surprising that in the years 1978 to 1981, the largest number of submitted and funded grants in the social sciences for the National Science Foundation's Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program came

from psychologists. It is also, perhaps, not surprising that the smallest number came from anthropologists!

The AAA, except during a brief period of the 1960s, has never had an organizational commitment or any channels established to encourage pre-college anthropology such as those set up by the American Psychological Association or the American Economics Association, which has also done much to stimulate pre-college education in that discipline. The obvious place one might look for support for pre-college anthropology would be within the AAA's Council on Anthropology and Education, but this group of professionals has shown little interest in providing strong institutional pressure and leadership in the area of pre-college anthropology. It is ironic that during the decade when the AAA increasingly recognized the importance of applied work within its ranks, the CAE should now give so little attention to this applied side of its initial commitment.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Anthropology began and continues to be primarily a research discipline. The field of anthropology and education has focused almost entirely upon research, although the applied side--disseminating anthropology through the American schools--should be a natural area for increased commitment and effort among anthropologists interested in anthropology and education.

Some of the lack of interest and effort may come from a sense that school anthropology lies too close to "popular" anthropology. In a discipline defining itself by its professional standards and the boundaries between itself and its non-professional popularizers, few anthropologists of stature dared venture into writing for either a school or a mass audience. With the recent success of books like Jane Goodall's In the Shadow of Man, Carl Johanson's Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind, and Elizabeth Marshall Thomas' Harmless People, it appears possible that anthropologists might at last write serious books for the non-college audience.

The 1980s may provide new opportunities for pre-college anthropology. First, there is greater interest in and awareness of anthropology among the American public, and in particular among teachers. More areas of school curriculum today intersect with anthropology: global education in world cultures, geography, biology, American history with units on Native Americans and ethnic minorities. According to recent research, anthropology has moved in the 1970s "from an unrecognized or hidden aspect of the social studies curriculum to a recognized instructional component or discipline" (Dynneson in this volume). Many materials now exist to teach anthropology at both the elementary and secondary levels: texts, paperback books, films and filmstrips, curriculum kits, and year-long units. In addition, there is increased interest in opening up various career possibilities utilizing anthropology. Lastly, there is a need to gain student enrollments in colleges where these are declining. If students study anthropology in high school, it is more likely they will study the subject in college.

What then can be done to encourage more pre-collegiate anthropology at

a time when the federal government is cutting back funding for education and teacher education, and when there is a general conservative movement within education? The Creationist movement targets the "evolutionists" directly, and within social studies the conservative movement is back to basics and citizenship education.

Two major areas of effort could have impact: teacher education in anthropology, and organized institutional support to encourage pre-collegiate anthropology, both as a separate subject and as a major integrating focus for other science and social studies subjects. The American Psychological Association has provided a successful model which has worked for twenty years, encouraging the teaching of psychology and organizing support throughout the country at the national, state, and local levels. Anthropology is a smaller discipline; the effort would necessarily be smaller, but a beginning could be made. At the national AAA office a staff member could be hired to establish a committee of professionals to work closely with the effort; to edit a newsletter specifically for teachers at the pre-college level; to gather materials and disseminate them via the newsletter and information packets--bibliographies, teaching ideas, resource books, texts, curriculum units. Guidelines for the certification of teachers could be established; and a careful tracking could be made, via questionnaires to state certification officials, of all teachers qualified to teach anthropology as well as all anthropology courses presently taught in the schools. Like APA, the AAA could offer a reduced rate and the newsletter to any teacher who joins as a high school affiliate.

Anthropology has not been a subject traditionally taught in schools. There are, however, very good reasons why anthropology, as Hewett stated in 1904, "should enrich the course of study of every school in the land." Anthropologists who believe in the humanizing potential of their discipline would do the profession a service by helping it broaden its base and its impact through all levels of the educational system. Perhaps in the next decade, anthropology, like psychology, will become a serious option for study by the high school student. Perhaps it is time for the profession to reach out to all students with its insights and knowledge of the nature and development of humankind.

REFERENCES CITED

Boas, Franz
1919 Report on the Academic Teaching of Anthropology. American Anthropologist 21:41-48.

Burnett, Jacquetta H.
1974 Anthropology and Education: An Annotated Bibliographic Guide. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.

Collier, Malcolm, and Edwin Dethlefsen
1968 Anthropology in the Pre-Collegiate Curriculum. Human Organization 27:11-16.

Darnell, Regna
1969 The Development of American Anthropology 1879-1920: From the Bureau of American Ethnology to Franz Boas. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania.

Dynneson, Thomas L.
1975 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials. Athens: University of Georgia. Anthropology Curriculum Project.
1981 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Progress or Peril? In Teaching Anthropology to Students and Teachers: Reaching a Wider Audience. Patricia J. Higgins and Ruth O. Selig, eds. Athens: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project.

Hewitt, Edgar Lee
1904 Anthropology and Education. American Anthropologist 6:574-575.
1905 Ethnic Factors in Education. American Anthropologist 7:1-16.

Hinsley, Curtis
1980 The Problem with Mr. Hewett: Academics and Popularizers in American Archeology, c. 1910. History of Anthropology Newsletter 7(1):7-9.

Kimball, Solon T.
1968 Anthropology and Education: A Symposium. Introductory Note. Human Organization 27:5.

Lindquist, Lawrence
1968 The Civic Responsibility of Anthropologists to Public Education. Human Organization 27:1-4.

Lowman, Kathy
1980 Personal Communication. Washington, D.C.: Educational Affairs Office, American Psychological Association.

National Science Foundation
1978 The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education. 7 volumes. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Rice, Marion J.
1977 Teaching Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: The Results of a Survey and Recommendations. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 8:193-195.

Rutherford, F. James
1980 Preface. In What are the Needs in Precollege Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education? Views from the Field. pp. v-ix. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, Directorate for Science Education.

Shaver, James P., O.L. Davis, and Suzanne M. Helburn
1980 An Interpretive Report on the Status of Precollege Social Studies Education Based on Three NSF-funded Studies, a Report from the National Council for the Social Studies. In What are the Needs in Precollege Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education? Views from the Field. pp.3-17. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, Directorate for Science Education.

Wissler, Clark
1920 Opportunities for Coordination in Anthropological and Psychological Research. American Anthropologist 22:1-12.

PRE-COLLEGIATE ANTHROPOLOGY: PROGRESS OR PERIL?

Thomas L. Dynneson
University of Texas, Permian Basin

Before the 1960s, pre-collegiate anthropology was an unrecognized or hidden component of the social studies curriculum for both elementary and secondary schools. Evidence from a survey of state social studies specialists indicates that by the end of the 1970s pre-collegiate anthropology has become part of the social studies curriculum in most states. The "new social studies" movement of the 1960s and 1970s was mainly responsible for this new and evolving status for anthropology. Recent conditions, however, indicate that there is a diminishing interest in pre-collegiate anthropology within the anthropology and education professions. If this trend continues, pre-collegiate anthropology may be destined to return to its former status as an unrecognized or hidden component of the social studies curriculum.

The Emergence of Pre-Collegiate Anthropology

Prior to World War II, pre-collegiate anthropology was nothing more than an incidental footnote in most social studies textbooks. From time to time geography or world history texts included some aspect of anthropology content when it related to a particular place or event. This situation was somewhat modified by the events that occurred during the war. American soldiers visited places and peoples all over the world. As a result of media coverage, the American public became curious and interested in foreign lands and "exotic" cultures. Social studies teachers became aware of their need to inform students about places and cultures that had been excluded from their classroom textbooks.

It was also in the 1940s and 1950s that many colleges and universities added or expanded anthropology departments on their campuses. With the establishment of more anthropology programs, some social studies teachers began to receive formal training in the academic study of anthropology. Some of these social studies teachers in turn organized units of study or elective courses for students attending the public schools. By the middle of the twentieth century experimental courses in pre-collegiate anthropology were being reported in various educational journals.

Experimental courses for the pre-collegiate level of instruction were difficult to organize. This was due mainly to the lack of teaching materials

designed for elementary or secondary schools. In addition, there were no guidelines to help teachers design units or courses of instruction in anthropology. Each teacher had to improvise a course based upon his or her own experiences.

Instructional materials were, and still are, the single most serious barrier to teaching anthropology in the elementary and secondary schools. Prior to the 1970s there were no textbooks written for pre-collegiate students, and teaching resources were very scarce. Planning a course for the first time required that the teacher put in endless hours locating suitable printed and audio-visual materials. While college textbooks were available to the teacher as a reference source, these textbooks were not appropriate for student use. There were no professional organizations to lend supportive services to teachers in this predicament.

In spite of these problems, some successful courses were organized and taught by determined teachers. Magazines such as The National Geographic were one of the few popular resources that were appropriate for pre-collegiate use. Museums were helpful as a source of information on specific topics, such as "North American Indians." During the 1940s and 1950s commercial textbook companies apparently were not willing to invest in the development of pre-collegiate anthropology materials. This was a justifiable position because the potential market for pre-collegiate anthropology materials was extremely limited.

In recent years television has contributed to the development of pre-collegiate anthropology. Through the media of television, the American public has learned about the work of anthropologists. Television has helped to make the work of prominent anthropologists popular with the American public. Through this type of exposure, almost everyone has learned something about the work of anthropologists, and this has tended to make the subject more acceptable as a public school topic. In addition, television has provided resources for the public school classroom. In time, universities and colleges may develop courses in anthropology that can be directly transmitted into the public school classroom. This would not only promote anthropology as a pre-collegiate discipline, but it also would give professional anthropologists a broader audience than they presently enjoy.

Pre-Collegiate Anthropology and The "New Social Studies"

The years spanning the period from 1955 to 1972 have been referred to as the era of the "new social studies." During this period, financial support from both federal and private sources became available for the purpose of developing new curriculum programs for elementary and secondary schools. These new programs were highly experimental and it was believed that some of them would become part of the social studies curriculum.

Many of these projects developed materials for the teaching of the social sciences. This was a departure from the more traditional programs for the social studies area. In the past, the social studies curriculum had contained elements of social science content, but the concepts were

simplified and not always characteristic of the various disciplines. In addition, the social studies curriculum had been concerned with the development of "good citizens" of a democratic society, and curriculum design and objectives were expected to relate to the emotional and social growth and development of the student. In contrast, many of the new and experimental social science curricula attempted to develop programs similar to the social science programs taught at the college and university levels.

In 1972 this author reviewed a large number of "new social studies" projects in an effort to identify ones which were primarily anthropological. While many of the new social studies programs contained aspects of anthropological content, few were specifically designed to teach anthropology as a discrete discipline. As a result of this review, seven projects were identified which contained great quantities of anthropological content. Three of these projects were exclusively anthropological (Dynneson 1972). They were the Anthropology Curriculum Project (ACP), the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project (ACSP), and Man: A Course of Study (MACOS).

The Anthropology Curriculum Project was developed at the University of Georgia under the direction of Marion J. Rice. This project attempted to develop instructional materials for elementary and junior high schools. Those working with this project produced grade level booklets that were experimentally taught in the schools. While this project continues to exist at the University of Georgia, the materials have never become commercially available to teachers.

The Anthropology Curriculum Study Project was located at the University of Chicago under the direction of Malcolm Collier. During the years of its existence, it produced a one semester secondary course that became available to teachers through the Macmillan Company. This project, entitled Patterns of Human History, was sponsored by the American Anthropological Association with the support of the National Science Foundation.

Man: A Course of Study was designed as a one year fifth grade course, and was produced under the direction of Peter Dow at the Educational Development Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The instructional materials for this course included a variety of printed materials and ethnographic films. An unusual aspect of the project was the establishment of regional centers that trained teachers to use this material in their respective school districts. This project experienced a great deal of initial success, but eventually it became one of the most controversial programs to be developed during the "new social studies." MACOS was criticized by groups of parents and disgruntled citizens who believed that it taught concepts that were not in step with traditional American values and included films that were too explicit for elementary children (Dow 1976).

Because of this experience with Man: A Course of Study, some anthropologists and educators began to question whether anthropological content might not be too sensitive and controversial for the pre-collegiate classroom. This issue was investigated in a 1978 survey of state social studies specialists (Kennedy 1978). The results of this survey do not support the notion that educators view anthropology as too controversial for the pre-

collegiate curriculum. This seems to contradict the experiences that involved Man: A Course of Study. The contradiction may be explained by the fact that other anthropology projects did not trigger controversy. It seems that Man: A Course of Study was never directly associated with the teaching of anthropology; therefore, the question of whether or not to teach anthropology in the public schools did not become an issue.

Research on Pre-Collegiate Anthropology

In order to determine the extent to which anthropology was being taught in elementary and secondary schools, surveys were mailed to state social studies specialists in 1972 and again in 1978. These surveys were intended to obtain information about the status of pre-collegiate anthropology in the social studies curriculum. The questionnaires contained items that related to the number of school districts involved in the teaching of anthropology, the nature of the programs being offered to students, the instructional materials used in the classroom, and the attitude of educators toward the teaching of anthropology.

The 1972 questionnaire was sent out by this author as part of his dissertational research (Dynneson 1972). Each person designated as a state social studies specialists was sent a copy of the questionnaire. The results from this survey were somewhat disappointing in that only 20 responses were received. While the survey did not provide an accurate picture of the status of pre-collegiate anthropology in the United States as a whole, it did provide some insights into the situation in the states that did participate in the study.

From these responses it was concluded that pre-collegiate anthropology was seldom taught in these 20 states. California was the most notable exception with 55 independent school districts offering programs at either the elementary or secondary level. The social studies specialists of the other 19 states reported only one or two school districts with programs in anthropology. Most of the programs reported used project materials that had been developed during the era of the "new social studies."

In 1977 Professor Marion J. Rice had a questionnaire printed in the October issue of Social Education. He intended to use this questionnaire as a means of identifying teachers throughout the United States who were currently teaching programs in anthropology. Social Education has a circulation of over twenty thousand and is the professional journal for social studies teachers. Unfortunately, Professor Rice received only 50 usable responses. While Rice was unsuccessful in identifying large numbers of teachers of anthropology, his efforts were laudable.

In 1978 Margaret Jones Kennedy attempted to determine the status of pre-collegiate anthropology by duplicating the 1972 Dynneson survey in an expanded form (Kennedy 1978). Kennedy received responses from all 50 of the state specialists, and the information collected through this survey was more comprehensive than that collected by any other means.

Upon completion of the analysis of her survey results, Kennedy was able to present a comprehensive report on the status of pre-collegiate anthropology in the United States. A summary of the conclusions of her study follows:

1) Within a ten year period anthropology has moved from an unrecognized or hidden aspect of the social studies curriculum to a recognized instructional component or discipline.

2) The curriculum materials that were produced during the "new social studies" era played a major role in the changing status of anthropology.

3) Educators tend to see anthropology as an interdisciplinary ingredient of the social studies rather than as a separate discipline; while it may be taught as an elective course in secondary schools, its perceived importance is as a supportive element in the study of human behavior.

4) Most of the social studies specialists report that anthropology courses are not required by either state or local officials.

5) Anthropology programs are more common in urban rather than in rural areas.

6) Anthropology content is not considered controversial among social studies educators, and there appears to be more overall support for the teaching of anthropology than there has been in the past.

7) The teaching of anthropology seems to depend on the availability of instructional materials, especially materials developed during the "new social studies" era and other standard commercial curriculum materials.

The information gathered in the 1978 survey indicates that anthropology was being taught in some form and at some grade level in about half of the states. This is an important change when compared to the very few states reporting instruction in anthropology in 1972. Nevertheless, there are serious problems that will limit the future development of pre-collegiate anthropology. Since the growth in pre-collegiate anthropology instruction is associated with the availability of instructional materials from projects or publishers, the fact that almost all the anthropology projects have ceased to exist may foretell a sharp decline in the future teaching of anthropology. In addition, there is little teacher preparation in anthropology, and the orientation of the social studies curriculum seems to be moving away from a social science emphasis.

Conclusion

History, civics, and geography traditionally have dominated the social studies curriculum. In the era known as the "new social studies" the social science disciplines received the attention of authors and project directors. New curricular materials had the effect of changing the status of anthro-

pology to a recognized subject field that could be taught as an interdisciplinary or discrete course at both the elementary or secondary levels. According to the surveys that were completed in the 1970s, pre-collegiate anthropology has been included as part of the social studies curriculum in almost half of the states. Curriculum specialists for each state seem to consider anthropology an acceptable area of instruction for the public schools, and instruction in anthropology has grown rapidly from 1972 to 1978.

In spite of these findings, there are several serious educational problems that are potentially damaging to the future development of pre-collegiate anthropology. The most serious is the availability of instructional materials, and since 1972, most of the curriculum projects that produced instructional materials in anthropology have gone out of existence. Because of this problem alone, pre-collegiate anthropology may revert to its former status as an unrecognized or hidden component of the social studies curriculum by the end of the 1980s.

REFERENCES CITED

Dow, Peter B.
1976 MACOS: Social Studies in Crisis. Educational Leadership 34:35-39.

Dynneson, Thomas L.
1972 Anthropology for the Schools: An Analysis of Selected Anthropology Curriculum Projects and Units with Content Ratings by Professional Anthropologists. Boulder, Colorado: ERIC/ChESS 50 004 027.
1975 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials. Athens: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project.

Kennedy, Margaret Jones
1978 A National Survey of Pre-Collegiate Anthropology Programs - 1977-78. Unpublished Masters Research Problems, The University of Texas of the Permian Basin.

Rice, Marion J.
1977 Teaching Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: The Results of a Survey and Recommendations. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 8:193-195.

LIMITS TO CHANGE: GETTING ANTHROPOLOGY INTO SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSROOMS

Patricia J. Higgins
SUNY, Plattsburgh

In 1977 a campaign began at SUNY Plattsburgh to get more secondary students exposed to the concepts, data, and modes of inquiry of anthropology. We hoped, of course, to stimulate greater student interest in anthropology, but in addition we saw our efforts as contributing to the revitalization of secondary social studies and concurrently broadening the perspective and sharpening the analytical skills of an upcoming generation of young citizens. We took strength from a number of sources: a string of calls for this type of effort from anthropologists and educators (Chilcott 1962; Hertzberg 1969; Spindler 1955); expressions of interest by local teachers who had taken our anthropology courses; revisions in the New York State curriculum giving more emphasis to culture studies; the support of educational professionals at the local and state levels; and, not least, our own faith in anthropology.

In cooperation with the college's social studies education professor and several high school teachers, we designed a summer workshop for teachers and applied for funding from the National Science Foundation's new Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program. We held two summer workshops, in 1978 and 1979,[1] and in the process increased our individual activities in secondary schools and strengthened our ties with social studies teachers. Our efforts have not produced as significant a change in local social studies education as we had hoped. We learned a great deal, however, about the problems and perspectives of social studies teachers and about the process, prospects, and limits to change in secondary education. My intention in this paper is to share some aspects of our experience in hopes that it might be applied to the improvement of future cooperative efforts.

To place our experiences in a broader context it is useful to look at the rather substantial body of recent literature on social studies education. Probably the most revealing set of data comes from three studies of the status of science education (including social studies) carried out in 1975-77 under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation. The data and conclusions of those studies as well as some

of the commentaries that have been generated by them provide much of the comparative material for this paper. I have also, of course, investigated the literature on anthropology in pre-college education, and solicited project proposals and/or recruitment materials and reports from the directors of other NSF Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Projects involving anthropology.[2] These various sources of information gave us new insights into our local experiences in the sphere of secondary social studies curriculum, instruction, and teacher preparation and provided confirmation of several hypotheses we had generated to explain our successes and failures.

The Plan: To Help Teachers Use Anthropology

One trend in social studies education in the last twenty years has been to supplement the traditional emphases on history and geography with a greater stress on the concepts and methodologies of other social sciences. The curriculum projects of the 1960s produced a wide variety of materials for use in secondary social studies,[3] and in New York State, at least, social studies syllabi and curricula materials produced by the State Education Department since the 1960s have included anthropological concepts and cover many subjects which fall within the scope of anthropology.

Effective implementation of the new curricula has been hampered, however, by lack of appropriate teacher training and experience. Nationally, the curriculum materials produced largely at federal expense in the 1960s were being used in less than twenty-five percent of secondary social studies classrooms by the mid-1970s (Weiss 1978:7). While there may be other reasons for the lack of adoption of these materials, the fact that relatively little effort was given to special pre-service or in-service teacher training in their use is a likely contributing factor.[4] Furthermore, a review of the literature on social science education through 1975 indicated that there were "major deficiencies in the social science course work of social studies teachers" (Helgeson et al. 1977:8). Although there had been some shift away from complete reliance on history in teacher training programs, this had not been supported by changes in state certification requirements as of the date of that study.

The situation with respect to subject matter training in anthropology was and is especially problematic. At SUNY Plattsburgh, for example, students can complete requirements for the Secondary Education Social Science Major without taking any courses in anthropology. Nor is anthropology required for any of the four specializations within the major. (Analysis of the transcripts of Secondary Education Social Science graduates of 1975-1979 showed that they <u>had</u> taken on the average one anthropology course each; that they had taken this many was largely due to the Secondary Social Studies Education advisor's personal interest in anthropology.) A review of current secondary education requirements and practices at other colleges in New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire indicated that the situation on our campus was not unusual. Moreover, teachers who completed their college education before the curricular reforms of the sixties were particularly unlikely to

have been exposed significantly to anthropology in formal classes.

With these conditions in mind, our workshops were designed not to create new curricula or to promote the teaching of anthropology as a separate course, but to encourage and assist teachers to implement in their social studies classrooms anthropologically oriented aspects of a curriculum already approved in New York at the state level. Our focus was on the integration of anthropological concepts and data with materials and concepts the teacher was already using. This "integrated subject-matter model" had been used in some previous NSF summer institutes in anthropology and had been found to be particularly productive; adding anthropological concepts and data to already existing courses had proved to be a relatively easy innovation, one that many teachers apparently welcomed, and one that could be implemented by individual teachers (Chilcott 1977:15). The model has been used as well in other recent NSF Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Projects in anthropology. (See, for example, Lanouette and Brooks in this volume.)

Our workshops were also designed to give attention to educational methods as well as to subject-matter content. Since our ultimate concern was the education of the students in the secondary classroom, we were not content to simply teach anthropology to the teachers. Rather, we wished to provide some examples of ways in which the concepts and data of anthropology (integrated with those of history and other social science disciplines) could be used to foster students' intellectual and affective growth. Other anthropologists who have worked wtih pre-college teachers had concluded that "any program aimed at teachers must include thinking about how teachers can use the material to teach. It is not sufficient to lecture at them, assuming they will be able to translate the newest and most sophisticated ideas and theories into their classroom use" (Mattson and Abshire-Walker 1976:24). Authors of the NSF review of social science education literature concur that "combining teacher training in academic content and instructional method may hold the best promise for affecting student outcomes" (Helgeson et al. 1977:9), and most recent NSF Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Projects involving anthropology have devoted some attention to instructional techniques.

The particular educational methods advocated in our workshop were based on an inquiry approach to teaching. The social studies educator working with us, like many of those active in the 1960s and 1970s (Elliott and Kennedy 1979), was highly committed to this approach and convinced us that inquiry teaching fostered the development of critical thinking by focusing on process rather than content. We agreed that critical thinking was an important skill for contemporary students, and we were also impressed by the way in which this teaching-learning strategy reproduced the procedure by which anthropologists (and other social scientists) form hypotheses, gather and process data, and draw conclusions. To encourage the development of inquiry-oriented methods as well as other knowledge, skills, and perspectives gained in the workshop, we required each participating teacher to prepare a curriculum unit for a course he/she expected to teach the next year--a curriculum unit that combined anthropological concepts and data with materials he/she was accustomed to using and that was based on an inquiry-oriented teaching strategy.

Problems in Application

We encountered a number of problems in carrying out our plans. Some of these may have been peculiar to our project and/or the conditions under which we were working; but others have been reported by other project directors, and some would appear to be endemic to social science education projects and perhaps to all science education projects. The remainder of this paper is addressed to three of these problems as we encountered them, and as we came to understand them in light of our growing knowledge of social studies education: recruitment; diverse perceptions of the social studies; and conflicting opinions on educational method. Each has multiple implications for cooperative endeavors involving anthropologists, educators, and classroom teachers, implications related to the basic nature of formal education in American society.

Attracting Teacher-Participants

In an immediate practical sense, probably the most serious of the problems we encountered in implementing our plans was our inability to generate a sufficiently large pool of applicants. Recognizing this problem during our first workshop, we redoubled our advertising and recruitment efforts for the second, without visible improvement in our results--this despite the fact that those teachers who participated in the workshops found each to be a useful and stimulating experience, one they indicated they would recommend to their peers. In the second year over 1000 brochures were mailed to secondary schools in Northern New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire; the project was announced through regional media; and personal contacts in the schools were utilized to publicize the workshop. When applications were slow to come in we initiated a time consuming and expensive telephone campaign through which we discovered that too often the brochures had not reached the social studies teachers. Despite our efforts, we generated only 40 applications the first year and 24 the second year.

Through teachers participating in the workshops we discovered several reasons for our recruitment difficulties. One significant impediment to participation by teachers from our region was financial. Though the National Science Foundation provided financial assistance to participating teachers, there were still some immediate expenses involved. More importantly, since the workshops were held during a four week period in July, participation precluded the paid summer employment which many teachers in Northern New York consider essential to the economic well-being of their families.

Other project directors have also noted that despite NSF support direct and indirect costs restrict the participation of some teachers. The problem is acute in rural regions because teachers in small town and rural schools are likely to be less well paid than their urban counterparts, and because the geographical dispersion of schools and teachers makes a full-time summer workshop the only practically feasible type. At the same time small town and rural teachers are in many ways more in need of such programs than are urban and suburban teachers. Small town and rural schools are generally

poorer and provide teachers with fewer alternative materials, and their curricula are generally more restricted and traditional (J. Wright 1979: 154-155). Facilities available in the community from which rural teachers can draw for materials and ideas are generally sparse, and there are fewer other teachers--a most important source of information about new developments in education for many teachers (Weiss 1978:16). Not surprisingly, adopters of new social studies (and other) materials are more likely to be urban than rural (Hahn 1977:152).

More disturbing than the financial problems was the second reason our teacher-participants gave us for the low number of applicants to our program; they perceived a general lack of interest on the part of their peers in continuing education programs of any type. The participants tended to see themselves as among the minority of social studies teachers with intellectual interests and commitment to improving teaching. Unfortunately, this perception is corroborated to some extent by the small number of teachers who make wide use of professional literature (J. Wright 1979:153) or who belong to professional organizations (in education or in their subject-matter specialities) (Shaver, Davis, and Helburn 1979:152).

On the other hand, there is some indication that interested and dedicated teachers have not always found college based workshops to be helpful. Teachers generally find the most valuable feature of in-service training programs to be the opportunity to share ideas with other teachers (Stake and Easley 1978:15). While they express interest in learning about new resource materials and getting assistance with alternate teaching strategies (Weiss 1978:16), the major concerns of teachers are often classroom management and socialization--a concern they can share with peers--rather than the debates about curriculum content or pedagogical styles that is the concern of most professionals who organize training programs (Shaver, Davis, and Helburn 1979:152).

A related problem with college based workshops may be the sense of hierarchical distance that often exists between college professors and pre-college teachers. Teachers who participated in designing our project were of the opinion that many of their colleagues would like assistance in using anthropological concepts and data, but that it would never occur to them to call upon college professors. There seemed to be several aspects to this reticence--anticipation that professors would be too busy or uninterested; expectation that a professor would not be able to put his/her contribution in a form useable in secondary (or elementary) classrooms; and an underlying concern that professors would take a condescending attitude toward teachers as well as students. That "limited communication, some distrust, and lack of credibility" often exists between teachers of various levels is widely recognized (Morrissett, Hawke, and Superka 1980: 564; see also Morrissett 1979:17), and one of the goals of the new series of NSF teacher development projects is to narrow that gap--"to develop and maintain communication and cooperation between scientists at colleges and universities and teachers in elementary and secondary schools" (National Science Foundation 1979:1).

The design of our workshop included several features to help bridge the gap between anthropologists and high school teachers. Both a professor of education and a high school teacher were included on the staff. Moreover, the anthropologists involved all had previous experience working with high school teachers and in high school (and elementary) classrooms as guests. In addition, we (the professors) defined ourselves as fellow learners, and in particular, as learners of educational techniques and strategies; and we tried to make our lessons in anthropology conform to the standards we were expecting of the secondary teachers in their social studies lessons. Finally, all the staff participated in the workshop full time and made a heavy commitment to individual consultation and to organization and participation in group social activities. These features of the workshop were highly appreciated by participants and have fostered continuing cooperation and communication with the participating teachers and some of their immediate colleagues. Unfortunately, these aspects of the program were not necessarily perceptible to the mass of potential applicants.

Social Studies Vs. Social Science

A more vexing problem was directly related to a key feature of our project and forced us to reassess the assumptions with which we began. Only twenty-four hours into the first workshop we realized (with some sense of shock) that we would have to readjust our goals from getting anthropology into social studies classrooms to getting even a basic scientific orientation into those classrooms. Anthropology, and social science, consists most broadly of an analysis of principles underlying human behavior. We had assumed that such analysis was, at least partially, what was taught in social studies and/or that everyone would agree that it ought to be taught. Instead, we discovered through the teacher-participants that the academic component of social studies was largely the teaching of facts, and that a number of the workshop participants believed that this was what social studies should be.

The problem was not simply that the curriculum in practice was dominated by history, but that the history taught was essentially factually oriented chronology. Teachers who expressed interest in using more anthropology in their courses thought of this almost solely in terms of anthropological content and facts. Moreover, those teachers who did (or desired to) deal with generalizations were most likely to do so on the level of "all humans..." or "all nations..." or "no humans..." The notion that we might work toward generalizations on the order of "under conditions X people are likely to..." (much less that we might use anthropological data to arrive at such generalizations) seemed to be a completely new idea to the teachers in our workshop. We soon learned, however, that in the context of pre-college education the problem of defining the social studies and the question of the role of social <u>science</u> in social <u>studies</u> are old and continuing issues.

The most commonly accepted purpose of social studies education is probably education for citizenship, but the specific knowledge, skills, and values thought to be most important for citizenship vary (Barr, Barth and Shermis 1977; Morrissett 1979; Tucker 1977). A recent definition endorsed by the National

Council for the Social Studies is typically all encompassing: "The basic goal of social studies education is to prepare young people to be humane, rational, participating citizens in a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent" (National Council for the Social Studies 1979:262). While patriotic values and knowledge of American history and government have been stressed traditionally, many educational theorists have come to the opinion that social studies ought to be conceptually rather than factually based. Some tend to adopt an academic model for the social studies and stress the development of intellectual skills. Others stress the ability to recognize important social issues and make rational and informed decisions as the crucial aspect of citizenship education in a participatory democracy. Still other social studies educators have focused upon personal development, socialization, value clarification, and the like, as the key features of social studies education. While some educators are more disturbed than others by the definitional ambiguity surrounding the social studies, virtually all agree that "the question of the purposes and boundaries of the field of social studies remains unsettled" (Helgeson et al. 1977:10).

The question of the role of social science and the scientific orientation in pre-college social studies is one aspect of the problem of defining the social studies. Though few social studies educators would equate social studies with social science, most do see the social sciences as a source of data for the social studies and do recognize the need for concepts and generalizations, as well as facts, to play a role in the social studies program (Elliott and Kennedy 1979; National Council for the Social Studies 1979). They also stress the fostering of a scientific orientation in the sense of supporting rationally-based knowledge, while recognizing that "many people consider other ways of knowledge such as revelation, common sense, and intuition as entirely legitimate, and even desirable" (National Council for the Social Studies 1979:263). Educational theorists tend to distinguish social studies from social science as being inherently more integrative and as drawing upon "the humanities, the natural sciences, the communication media, and the perceptions of students" as well as the social sciences (National Council for the Social Studies 1979:263). They also stress the need for social studies to be concerned with values and attitudes, and with decision-making and participation, in contrast to the presumably objective, descriptive, and value-free approach of the social sciences.

From the perspective of social scientists, however, and particularly social scientists who are simultaneously (college) teachers, it does appear that "much of what social studies educators say about social sciences, in asserting differences between the two fields, is not accurate" (Morrissett 1979:15-16). At the very least, many educators appear to overstate what are essentially differences in emphasis. Discussions of the proper role of social science in social studies do have the flavor of a territorial dispute. Social studies educators are willing to draw upon the social sciences for data and concepts, but they are on guard not to relinquish control over social studies education to social scientists.

In fact, the classroom teacher continues to exert considerable control over the content of social studies education, and while leading educators and social scientists have been discussing these weighty issues, teachers have been proceeding largely upon traditional lines. Other studies have

confirmed our impression that in practice the most academically oriented content of social studies is the teaching of facts rather than concepts or generalizations. For example, Elliott and Kennedy, two Australian educators, observed on the basis of a year's experience in American schools that "by and large, social studies content and practice do not appear to follow the writings of social studies methods texts, and/or curriculum projects, or the arguments of leading social studies educators" (1979:295). The content of the social studies course continues to be closely tied to the commercial textbook (Weiss 1978:16). While recent texts do make greater use of the concepts and methodologies of the social sciences (Superka, Hawke, and Morrissett 1980:366), the topics considered by publishers to be "most important to the sale of instructional materials (especially textbooks) are generally the traditional ones such as chronological, narrative history of the United States, name and place geography, physical geography, map and globe skills, and reading skills" (Schneider and Van Sickle 1979:465). Further, the ethnographic case studies sponsored by NSF in 1976-77 revealed that in practice "the social studies curriculum was primarily about history and government, and to some extent, about current social problems and about understanding oneself. It was rarely about social science, the systematic inquiry into social phenomena" (Stake and Easley 1978:19:4).

Our experience suggests that this is not because classroom teachers are consciously or overtly hostile to a scientific orientation. Rather, they tend to share the common American admiration for science, though they have not been trained in science and are not accustomed to thinking about social phenomena scientifically. If this were the only barrier to the introduction of a scientific orientation into secondary social studies classrooms, it could presumably be removed by changes in the training of teachers and by workshops such as ours. Unfortunately, two other factors also appear to be involved: the teachers' belief that facts must be mastered before concepts or generalizations; and the actual pre-eminence of socialization efforts over academic content in the classroom. These factors were most apparent in our workshop in connection with disagreements over educational methods.

Inquiry Vs. Expository Approaches to Teaching

The fact that all the teachers in our workshop did not readily embrace an inquiry approach to teaching, even theoretically, was not quite as surprising to the anthropologists on the staff as the fact that so few were scientifically oriented. We had only recently been introduced to "inquiry" as a formally organized and recognized style of pedagogy ourselves. In what we had read and heard about inquiry teaching, it seemed an eminently sensible and desirable approach, providing at least that one subscribe to the desirability of fostering analytical thinking in students.

The inquiry approach is based on the assumption that knowledge <u>content</u> is changing rapidly and therefore that the <u>skills</u> of "independent, rational thinking" (Beyer 1979:iv)--and not just content--must be imparted to students who are to live in a participatory democracy. Advocates argue that "of all the teaching strategies used in our schools today, only inquiry teaching enables us to engage in rational thinking while we consciously and systematically learn the thinking processes and operations as well as the information

we are using" (Beyer 1979:v). Teachers using this approach are to guide students through learning experiences which require them to recognize problems; pose hypotheses; collect, arrange, and assess data pertinent to the testing of hypotheses; draw conclusions; apply the conclusion to new data; and formulate generalizations. The similarities between this approach to teaching and the general strategy of scientific research made it attractive to advocate its use as a vehicle for the integration of anthropological concepts, data and "modes of inquiry" into secondary social studies.

The teachers participating in our workshops, however, were even more resistant to inquiry strategies than they were to viewing social studies as properly concerned with social science. One reason may be that since they defined themselves as professional educators rather than social scientists, they could admit to weaknesses in their social science training and entertain alternate notions about the concepts and content that they might be teaching more easily than they could accept the notion that the teaching methods they had been using were in need of change. Advocates of the inquiry approach may themselves contribute to this resistence by arguing that the approach results in "better learning--in terms of retention, transfer, and achievement--than do traditional strategies" (Beyer 1979:366), when there is little research to support this, and by suggesting--not too subtly--that any creative, flexible, skilled, and secure teacher would find this approach rewarding and productive (Beyer 1979:167).

From the participants in our workshops, we learned that social studies teachers have many objections to the use of this teaching strategy. First, they find it too time consuming. Advocates agree that it takes more time to cover a given topic using this approach than it does using an expository method and they agree that inquiry may not be suitable for all topics or goals (Beyer 1979:366). But the objection that the approach is too time consuming in fact disguises the real issue, which is one of priorities in social studies education. Few teachers argue with the goal of teaching thinking, but in practice they are concerned with the teaching of facts, and they believe that more facts can be transmitted by other means. Advocates of the inquiry approach argue that facts are learned better by students who seek them out in search of materials that test their own hypotheses, and they can point to research indicating that students taught through an inquiry method do as well on factual tests as those taught by other methods (Martorella 1977; see also Tucker 1977). (That they also do better on higher order cognitive behavior, as the advocates assume, has not yet been clearly demonstrated.)

More to the point, therefore, is that a more carefully controlled selection of facts can be transmitted by means other than inquiry. Teachers in New York state can and do rely on the existence of the state-wide Regents Examination in Social Studies to justify the intensity with which they pursue the teaching of a standard body of facts. (This is the case even though the examination in recent years has come to rely more on questions which require students to make use of higher cognitive skills.) While few states require competency exams in social studies today, some 22% do plan to initiate specific competency requirements (Weiss 1978:23), and this trend is likely to reinforce teachers in their objection to the inquiry approach.

Moreover, findings from the NSF studies of science education indicate that national achievement testing programs are concentrated on lower cognitive levels (Helgeson et al. 1979:9), and that many science teachers support efforts "to make teaching more explicit and more rational and to make learning more uniform and more measureable" (Stake and Easley 1978:19:11).

To the extent that teachers refrain from using an inquiry approach because of the need to prepare students for a factually oriented state-wide exam, teachers of classes which are not preparing to take the Regents exam would seem to be free to make more use of an inquiry approach in the classroom. In practice, they do not do so because of a second objection to the approach; they consider the inquiry approach to be especially unsuitable for slow learners. The argument generally is that students must have a basic command of facts before they can productively formulate hypotheses and grapple with concepts and generalizations, and students in non-Regents classes are defined as being more deficient in 'facts'. Teachers also cite the lack of motivation among such students as an impediment to the use of this approach, rarely considering that it might be the consistency with which the students have been fed external facts in social studies that accounts for their lack of motivation. Advocates of the approach assert that, on the contrary, slow learners are often more willing to engage in the first steps of inquiry (hypothesizing) than are bright students, and although their ability to sustain a line of inquiry may be less, they, like faster learners, inevitably learn facts and concepts at the same time (Beyer 1979:387-380).

A third type of objection raised by our teachers to the inquiry approach was that the approach is too difficult to use in a large class, or a class made up of students of diverse backgrounds, or a class that lacked previous practice in inquiry, or a school that lacked abundant resources... In short, it is difficult to manage a teaching strategy in which students generate questions and pursue answers individually or in small groups and to maintain order at the same time. Admittedly, such an approach requires a good deal of preparation on the part of the teacher. Teachers are advised that though the approach is "student-centered" they must "plan or devise a learning experience that will facilitate student inquiry," including "creating and sequencing a series of activities" and "collecting and preparing learning materials," as well as directing or guiding inquiry. But then, after all, "any inquiry lesson can proceed in a direction quite different from that planned by the teacher" (Beyer 1979:165). The good teacher ought to be comfortable with this lack of predictability, it is felt, even though the students themselves are likely to object, at least initially, when their teacher thus departs from student expectations of what a teacher ought to do (Beyer 1979:385). Yet teachers are often judged more by their ability to maintain order in the classroom than they are by their ability to foster creative thinking. Their reluctance to try this approach for fear of disorder and of potential challenges to the position of the teacher is not unrealistic.

Studies indicate that the teachers in our workshops are not alone in their failure to embrace an inquiry approach to teaching. Elliott and Kennedy, for example, observed that despite the tendency for leading educators to advocate inquiry learning and inductive teaching, "much, if not most, social studies teaching is expository in nature" (1979:294). A national

survey of teachers, principals, and superintendents also conclude that in social studies, as in science and mathematics, lecture and teacher controlled discussion are the predominant teaching techniques used and that the textbook continues to play a central role in class (Weiss 1978:16-17). The use of a textbook and an inquiry approach are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and recent texts do incorporate a greater diversity of teaching techniques (Superka, Hawke, and Morrissett 1980:366). But "the most common scene" in social studies classrooms observed by NSF ethnographers was "the teacher asking questions about the reading assignment, often requiring verbatim responses, stressing the value of good information from reliable sources, particularly the textbook" (Stake and Easley 1978:19:7). To the extent that science is taught, therefore, it is taught not as scientific inquiry, but rather as what experts have found to be true.

Perhaps a more important conclusion of these same studies is that on the whole teachers are a conservative group who tend to see education as promoting conformity rather than creative thought. Among teachers of every type of science, "a common and vigorously defended purpose [is] that of socialization...observance of the mores of the community, submitting personal inclinations to the needs of the community, conforming to the role of 'good student', and getting ready for the next rung on the educational ladder" (Stake and Easley 1978:19:4). While educators and social scientists attempt to help teachers deal with controversial issues in the classroom, teachers in fact appear to have been "carefully selected to fit the community and...anxious not to put children or parents in anguish" (Stake and Easley 1978:19:5). Elliott and Kennedy also observed that the value issues implicit in social studies content were rarely explored in the classroom (1979:295). This conservativeness and the pre-emptive concern with socialization influences both the choice of subject-matter and instructional techniques and does not bode well for a technique that encourages students to pose their own questions and seek out the data necessary to draw their own conclusions.

Conclusion

Efforts to promote greater use of anthropology in pre-collegiate classrooms must contend not only with the scarcity of specially designed resources and materials (see Dynneson in this volume) and the lack of appropriate teacher training and experience. Such efforts must also contend with deeper issues in social studies education: 1/ the ability of college based professionals (whether anthropologists or educators) to reach the classroom teacher physically, intellectually, and motivationally; 2/ the relationship of social science to social studies and appropriateness of a scientific orientation to social studies; and 3/ the relative merits of inquiry, discovery, or inductive methods versus expository approaches to teaching. These issues are related to the larger question of the proper goals and priorities for general education in the United States today.

As Lindquist pointed out some time ago, "individuals teach in the classroom and reflect the limits or extent of their own training"; he recommended therefore that "the anthropologist who wishses to contribute to public education must labor on the local front" (1968:2-3). We would add that even here success may be limited. To apply an understanding common to ethnographers of education: teachers, on the whole, operate within the constraints of their

own culture and transmit and preserve the basic knowledge and values of that culture. In our advocacy both of social studies as social science and of an inquiry approach to teaching, we were resisting the natural and perhaps even proper tendency for mass educational institutions to be conservative--to teach the next generation to accept the mores of the community and the authority of scientists unquestioningly. Though we know as anthropologists that this is what schools are all about, as educators we too try to influence our culture through shaping the minds of the young.

NOTES

1. The workshops were supported by National Science Foundation grants SPI77-14292 (1978) and SPI79-02127 (1979). The project staff, who participated jointly in planning and evaluation as well as implementation of the workshops, consisted of Dr. Patricia J. Higgins (Project Director), Assistant Professor of Anthropology, SUNY Plattsburgh; Dr. Mark N. Cohen, Associate Professor of Anthropology, SUNY Plattsburgh; Mr. John Caramia, Sr., Professor of Education, SUNY Plattsburgh; Mr. Richard Boulrice (Instructional Assistant - 1978), Secondary Social Studies Teacher, Peru Central Schools, Peru, New York; and Ms. Ruth Mowry (Instructional Assistant - 1979), Secondary Social Studies Teacher, Beekmantown High School, Beekmantown, New York.

2. Thanks are extended to the following project directors who provided such materials: Dr. Alison S. Brooks, George Washington University; Dr. Walton Koch, Grand Valley State Colleges, Allendale, Michigan; Dr. Donald A. Messerschmidt, Washington State University, Pullman; Dr. Delores Reed-Sanders, Pan American University, Edenberg, Texas; Dr. F. Ugboaja Okaegbulam, University of South Florida, Tampa; and Dr. Curtis W. Wienker, University of South Florida, Tampa.

3. For more information on these projects see Chapin and Gross (1973), especially Chapter 7, and Dynneson (1975), Chapter IV.

4. For a review of research on adoption and diffusion patterns in the social studies see Hahn 1977.

REFERENCES CITED

Barr, Robert D., James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis
1977 Defining the Social Studies. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies.

Beyer, Barry K.
1979 Teaching Thinking in Social Studies: Using Inquiry in the Classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Chapin, June R., and Richard E. Gross
1973 Teaching Social Studies Skills. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Chilcott, John N.
1962 A Proposal for the Unification of Secondary School Courses Through Anthropology. The Clearing House 36(7). (Reprinted in Educational Patterns and Cultural Configurations, Joan I. Roberts and Sherrie K. Akinsanya, eds., pp. 325-330.) N.Y.:David McKay Co., Inc., 1976.

Chilcott, John N.
1977 Curriculum Models for Teaching Anthropology. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 3:14-18.

Dynneson, Thomas L.
1975 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials. Athens, Georgia: Anthropology Curriculum Project, University of Georgia.

1981 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Progress or Peril? In Teaching Anthropology to Students and Teachers: Reaching a Wider Audience. Patricia J. Higgins and Ruth O. Selig, eds. Athens: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project.

Elliott, Michael J., and Kerry J. Kennedy
1979 Australian Impressions of Social Studies Theory and Practice in Secondary Schools in the United States. Social Education 43:291-296.

Hahn, Carole L.
1977 Research on the Diffusion of Social Studies Innovations. In Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975. Francis Hunkins, ed., pp. 137-177. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies.

Helgeson, Stanley L., Marilyn N. Suydam, Patricia E. Blosser, Alan Osborne, and Robert W. Howe
1977 The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955-1975 (A Literature Review) Executive Summary. In The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Educational Practices in U.S. Schools: An Overview and Summaries of Three Studies. Stanley L. Helgeson, Robert E. Stake, Iris R. Weiss, et al. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Hertzberg, Hazel
1969 Using Anthropology to Teach New York State History. In The Social Studies: Structure, Models, and Strategies. Martin Feldman and Eli Seifman, eds., pp. 276-280. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Lanouette, JoAnne, and Alison S. Brooks
1981 Anthropology for Teachers. In Teaching Anthropology to Students and Teachers: Reaching a Wider Audience. Patricia J. Higgins and Ruth O. Selig, eds. Athens: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project.

Lindquist, Lawrence W.
1968 The Civic Responsibility of Anthropologists to Public Education. Human Organization 27:1-4.

Martorella, Peter N.
1977 Research on Social Studies Learning and Instruction: Cognition. In Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975. Francis Hunkins, ed., pp. 15-53. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies.

Mattson, Phyllis H., and Tina Abshire-Walker
1976 An Experiment in Education: Anthropology for Public School Teachers. Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly 7:22-25.

Morrissett, Irving
1979 Citizenship, Social Studies, and the Academician. Social Education 43: 12-17.

Morrissett, Irving, Sharryl Hawke, and Douglas P. Superka
1980 Six Problems for Social Studies in the 1980s. Social Education 44: 561-569.

National Council for the Social Studies
1979 Revision of the NCSS Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines. Social Education 43: 261-273.

National Science Foundation
1979 Guide for Preparation of Proposals and Project Award Management: Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program. Washington, D.C.: NSF, Division of Scientific Personnel Improvement.

Schneider, Donald O., and Ronald L. Van Sickle
1979 The Status of the Social Studies: The Publishers' Perspective. Social Education 43: 461-465.

Shaver, James P., O.L. Davis, Jr., and Suzanne W. Helburn
1979 The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions from Three NSF Studies. Social Education 43: 150-153.

Spindler, George
1955 Anthropology and Education: An Overview. In Education and Anthropology. Stanford: Stanford University Press. (Reprinted with revisions in Education and Culture, pp. 53-83. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.)

Stake, Robert and Jack Easley
1978 Case Studies in Science Education. Executive Summary (Chapter 19). In The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Educational Practices in U.S. Schools: An Overview and Summaries of Three Studies. Stanley L. Helgeson, Robert E. Stake, Iris R. Weiss, et al. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Superka, Douglas P., and Sharryl Hawke
1980 Social Roles: A Focus for Social Studies in he 1980s. Social Education 44: 577-586.

Superka, Douglas, Sharryl Hawke, and Irving Morrissett
1980 The Current and Future Status of the Social Studies. Social Education 44: 362-369.

Tucker, Jan L.
1977 Research on Social Studies Teaching and Teacher Education. In Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975. Francis Hunkins, ed., pp. 97-135. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies.

Weiss, Iris R.
1978 1977 National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education Highlights Report. In The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Educational Practices in U.S. Schools: An Overview and Summaries of Three Studies. Stanley L. Helgeson, Robert E. Stake, Iris R. Weiss, et al. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Wright, J. Zeb
1979 The Status of Precollege Social Studies Educational Practices in U.S. Schools. In What are the Needs in Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education? Views from the Field. pp. 147-157. Washington: Government Printing Office.

ANTHROPOLOGY FOR TEACHERS

JoAnne Lanouette
Alison S. Brooks
George Washington University
Smithsonian Institution

Why teach teachers anthropology? Why teach anthropology in pre-college classrooms? Because anthropology, as the study of human origins, varieties, and cultures, provides an integrated view of the nature and development of humankind, whether studied through the natural or the social sciences. Anthropology addresses directly students' need for global understanding and helps teachers and students better understand their multi-cultural world.

Today teachers wrestle with the public questioning of biological evolution; with the recent influx of students from Asian and Latin cultures and the resulting struggle for bilingualism; and with a concern for academic "basics". Anthropology can give teachers the means to handle these issues and others, and further, the subject can help dispel hostility or apathy about people who are different. As a broad-based discipline, anthropology provides objective ways to appreciate cultural and biological differences, thereby assisting teachers and students in reducing ethnocentrism, uninformed and unreasoned responses, and prejudice.

Even if high school students do not continue studying anthropology in college, they have gained an invaluable intercultural perspective:

> If we cannot know why other people express themselves as they do and why they act as they do, I feel we cannot achieve our own cultural or national ends without conflict. The aim [of teaching anthropology] is purely selfish in the last analysis. It is self-serving of a grand kind that reaches for intercultural understanding, communication, and harmony.
>
> We ought to be able to stand back and view ourselves as others might view us; we ought to be able to see others as they see themselves. These are the first steps toward effective cultural learning, but they require skills which are not ordinarily sharpened in our traditional curricula [Ferguson 1976:25] .

How can pre-college teachers be educated to impart these cultural learning skills and perspectives to their students? Our experience suggests that the best approach is not an undergraduate introductory anthropology course, a series of graduate seminars, or a classroom methods course. Basic concepts

in anthropology and concrete activities for the pre-college classroom must be combined in a course specifically designed for teachers' needs.

Such a course is included in the Anthropology for Teachers Program, a joint effort of the anthropology departments at George Washington University and The Smithsonian Institution, funded by the National Science Foundation.[1] Approximately 175 junior high and high school teachers from the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area have participated in the course during the past three years (1978-1981). These teachers come from public and private schools and teach biology, life science, social studies, geography, world cultures, African studies, anthropology, sociology, or ancient history. While a few teachers majored in anthropology as undergraduates, most had little or no anthropology background. About one-third of the participants are teaching primarily minority students, and others work with deaf students, reading disabled, elementary gifted students, and students in vocational programs.

To understand how the Anthropology for Teachers Program works, it is helpful to answer four questions: 1) How is the program organized? 2) What are the advantages of this approach? 3) What has been the impact of the program on teachers and students? and 4) What are the implications of the program for the anthropology profession?

Organization of the Program

Although the program is multi-faceted, and not simply a course, the most intensive part of the program is the tuition-free course called "Anthropology for Teachers". Teachers enroll for two semesters, receiving four graduate credits each semester from George Washington University. The course is taught at local public schools in three sections: District of Columbia, Northern Virginia, and Montgomery County, with about twenty-five selected teachers in each section. In addition to the course, the program includes the Anthropology Resource Center for Teachers, Evening Seminars, and a newsletter, Anthro·Notes. All three help teachers stay in touch with a community of interested anthropologists and fellow teachers beyond the course, and they are available to anyone interested in teaching anthropology.

Program staff[2] did intensive groundwork in schools the year before the program began. Interviews with fifty representative teachers and discussions with science and social studies supervisors and other administrators proved extremely useful. The teachers explained their needs and difficulties in presenting anthropological material to secondary school students and also explained what they desired in a teacher training course. Using these responses, we identified a target population for the course, gained familiarity with local curricula and teachers' needs relevant to anthropology, began to understand local concerns, and established relationships with appropriate people in school hierarchies. This information and resulting networks not only made recruiting participants easier, but also, and more importantly, enabled us to make the program responsive to the concerns and goals of teachers and local school districts.

Both the advertisement of the program and the criteria used for select-

ing course participants are important elements in our approach. Building on the previous groundwork, we distribute our brochures to each science and social studies resource teacher or department chairperson in area pre-college schools. We place notices in superintendents' bulletins and teachers' newsletters. The staff also talks with science and social studies supervisors, principals, and resource teachers and describes the course at teachers meetings. Past participants explain the course to other interested teachers and our newsletter, Anthro·Notes, announces the program. Because we have double the number of teachers applying than we can accept, we can be selective. We choose about 75 teachers who can use our course in their classes, have solid academic records, appear highly motivated, and will have an impact on a large number of students.

The course is organized so it meets our major goals--providing the participants with: 1) a firm foundation in anthropology and 2) practical teaching strategies that can be used to incorporate anthropology into everyday teaching. Eight monthly topics are chosen from physical and cultural anthropology. The topics are of current interest, have good teaching materials available for both teachers and secondary students, and most importantly, are applicable to the subjects taught by science and social studies teachers. For example, in 1980-81 the eight monthly topics were: Primate Behavior; Human Evolution; Growing Up in African Cultures; Anthropologists' Fieldwork; Human Variation; Health, Healing, and Religion Among Native Americans; Civilizations of the Past; Archeology and Ecology; and Anthropologists Look at America. Teachers help the staff plan the course, and every year teachers evaluate all course elements so that topics and approaches change in response to teachers' assessments.

Each month the course offers four different learning experiences. The month's first class meeting consists of an introductory lecture reviewing the recent trends and significant questions and issues for the topic. The second class meeting provides a teaching activity which presents an experiential, often inductive, lesson that teachers can use in their own classes. During this week the participants also receive annotated bibliographies for students and teachers, listings of museum activities, films, published curricular materials, and further classroom activities pertinent to the topic.

In the third week teachers from all three sections attend a Saturday seminar either at the National Museum of Natural History, George Washington University, or a local resource of interest to teachers, such as the Museum of African Art or the Alexandria Archaeological Research Center. Museum curators or university anthropologists[3] discuss their research and its relationship to the monthly topic. How does an anthropologist pose and research a problem? What are the significant findings? What resources can teachers use? During the Saturday sessions, teachers may also explore a museum hall or exhibit with a professional in that subject area or with one of the hall's developers to understand the reasoning and significance of the content and design. Some seminars take place in the anthropologist's office. For example, Dr. Lawrence J. Angel, Curator, lectured to the teachers on detection of diseases in ancient populations in his physical anthropology laboratory at the Museum of Natural History and demonstrated his points with bone specimens. Through the Saturday

seminars teachers have access to current research and they gain an unique behind-the-scenes view of anthropological museums and research centers.

The fourth class meeting each month is a teacher workshop where teachers present oral reports and teaching units of their own design. Readings pertinent to the topic are discussed and material for the month is summarized. The teachers synthesize and analyze the content each month through an essay.

The monthly topic approach with these four different learning experiences combines content, application for the classroom, and the joint resources of a museum and a university. The chart below illustrates how we combined subject matter and teaching resources for one monthly topic.

MONTHLY TOPIC: PRIMATE BEHAVIOR

First Week: 4-6 p.m.	INTRODUCTORY LECTURE Perspectives of anthropology, primate pattern of adaptation, history of primate research, socialization, individual behavior, and group interaction.
Second Week: 4-6 p.m.	TEACHING ACTIVITY Primate Films: "Baboon Behavior: Young Infant" and "Chimpanzee Infant Development". Human mother-infant observation. Bibliography for teachers and students, films, and activities.
Third Week: Saturday 10-12	SEMINAR Dr. Geza Teleki, Associate Professorial Lecturer, George Washington University, discusses "Primates in the Wild: Their Significance and Precarious Future" based on his research at the Gombe Stream Reserve in Tanzania and in Sierra Leone.
Fourth Week: 4-6 p.m.	TEACHER WORKSHOP Monkey House, National Zoological Park. Observation exercises on physical differences, locomotion, mother-infant relationships, communication, and interaction behavior in different ages of non-human primates. Readings are discussed.
READINGS:	J.R. Napier. PRIMATES AND THEIR ADAPTATIONS. Carolina Biological Supply Co., 1977. Jane Lancaster. PRIMATE BEHAVIOR AND THE EMERGENCE OF HUMAN CULTURE. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975. Jane Goodall. "Life and Death at Gombe," NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC, Vol. 155, No. 5, May 1979, pp. 593-620. Geza Teleki, "The Omnivorous Chimpanzee," SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, Vol. 228, No. 1, January 1973, pp. 32-42.

Other aspects of the Anthropology for Teachers Program supplement the course and are available to anyone interested in teaching anthropology. The Anthropology Resource Center for Teachers, housed in the Naturalist

Center at the Museum of Natural History, is designed to allow teachers to review appropriate materials for teaching anthropology at the secondary level. It has grown into a reference collection of anthropology curriculum units (such as Patterns in Human History); filmstrip sets; educational games; books; film catalogs; Odyssey video tape cassettes; and files of area resources such as embassy programs. These materials may be used by either teachers or students to complement the regular self-teaching experiences in the Naturalist Center, especially those in human osteology and lithic technology.

The program staff also sponsors Evening Seminars on special topics which bring together a wide range of people interested in teaching anthropology. In 1979 one meeting introduced the Anthropology Resource Center for Teachers to about one hundred people. At this meeting, Beatrice Kleppner, a Boston high school anthropology teacher, described with films the community fieldwork experiences she conducted with her students. In addition, a program on experiencing other cultures through drama developed by Colin Turnbull from his experiences with the Ik and the Mbuti pygmies was also explained.

The fourth part of the program is a newsletter for anthropologists and teachers called Anthro·Notes. Three issues are published each academic year and sent free-of-charge to about 2,000 people in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area and around the nation. In Winter 1981 a special section, "Boston Notes," written by Boston anthropologists and teachers, was introduced, and we now have more than 200 Boston teachers on the mailing list. The goal of Anthro·Notes is to communicate ideas and resources for teaching anthropology and to give a sense of community to teachers interested in pre-collegiate anthropology. The newsletter includes upcoming events, reviews of new journal articles, a teachers' corner describing classroom activities, annotated bibliographies, museum activities, summer opportunities, and reviews of new curricular materials.

Advantages of the Program

We now reach the second question posed at the beginning of this paper. What are the advantages of this approach? First, the course provides an academically solid, in-depth graduate training experience for teachers who are working adults expecting maximum return for the time they invest. They do not want to receive watered down undergraduate courses, or to be taught as if they were tenth graders. It is not enough to simply provide an intellectual framework for studying anthropology, nor is it adequate to merely present teaching activities and resources. Introducing teachers to anthropologists, their research, and their laboratories does not suffice either. But if all three are combined, teachers can convert information about human evolution and cultural diversity into actual classroom teaching. Exposed to this variety of experiences, teachers are then able to convey to their own students much about the vitality of anthropology as a science and about scientists as professionals.

Second, the course enables teachers to use what they learn in the classes they presently teach. For those teachers who majored in anthropology, the course updates their knowledge and gives them suitable class-

room activities and resources. For teachers with no background in anthropology, the course provides a foundation in anthropological perspectives as well as ways to teach the subject to students. The needs of such a heterogeneous group are met since the topic approach does not depend on a particular level of knowledge and experience. Rather it leads teachers from general overviews to consideration of particular scientific developments. It is also conducive to the generation of ideas for incorporating anthropology into varied curricula. In the foreseeable future, anthropology is unlikely to form a major part of a secondary school curriculum, but it can be integrated easily into biology, geography, social studies, and history classes. The course design helps teachers achieve that integration.

A third advantage lies with the intellectual backbone of the program, its staff and organization. The primary members of the teaching staff (Lanouette, Selig, and Brooks) are in continous contact with the teachers throughout both semesters. They combine teaching experience at the secondary school level with field and laboratory research in several of the subdisciplines of anthropology. In the Saturday seminars, teachers meet a diverse group of anthropological scholars. Many advantages result from this combination of staff and guest speakers. A single staff member with secondary school experience is in charge of each section giving continuity to the learning in the course. The program achieves overall coordination through its team approach and the director's involvement. The teachers learn directly from a wide variety of research scholars who are eager to speak with secondary school teachers. Teachers thus learn anthropology from the practitioners, learning more about science in general as an ongoing research process.

Fourth, and finally, the Anthropology for Teachers Program simultaneously utilizes strengths and resources of both a museum, the National Museum of Natural History, and a university, George Washington University. The museum provides us access to a staff of people working in curatorial research and education and a vast library and archival system. The staff we consult and invite to our classes as guest speakers. The library, archives, self-teaching Naturalist Center facility, and various laboratories (conservation, artifact processing, photography, and physical anthropology) offer learning opportunities and resources for the teachers. The Smithsonian's commitment to public education is seen in its wide variety of educational programs for all ages and more particularly in the museum's concern for making anthropology understandable and accessible whether through exhibits, a film lecture series, an outreach program to local schools, or publications for schools such as Art to Zoo and Let's Go. In addition, the university provides researchers, teachers, a strong library system, and the academic structure and accreditation necessary for taking courses and receiving credit. The combination of the two departments of anthropology creates a special museum/university learning opportunity for teachers and one which could well serve as a model for similar programs in other cities.

The Anthropology for Teachers Program overall encourages the teaching of anthropology in the Washington, D.C. area on both an intensive and extensive level. On the intensive level a small group of teachers spends at least a semester and usually a year taking for credit a graduate level course in anthropology specifically designed to meet their needs. On the extensive

level, a more widely-extended audience of interested teachers, school administrators, and anthropologists at all education levels participates. They are interested in the wide use of anthropology in schools but cannot commit intensive time to a course.

Impact of the Program

Course participants have identified various ways in which the Anthropology for Teachers Program has educationally benefitted teachers and students.[4] Many teachers diversified their approach and updated their materials as a result of participation in the course. Several social studies teachers now have students do fieldwork projects in their communities. Through visits with archeologists to sites, interviews with older citizens, and students' own reading, one teacher had her students write a history of the community surrounding the school. Another developed a unit on cross-cultural attitudes toward money. Biology teachers discovered new ways to use museums, and several history teachers designed multi-disciplinary approaches to history with anthropology as the core discipline.

Some social studies teachers have found anthropological materials motivating for slow learners. Others discovered that their minority students were especially interested in a unit which merged course materials on race into the history curriculum. While several eighth grade teachers designed six week anthropology units, about five teachers have started separate anthropology courses for the first time, mostly as a semester elective; and another updated his whole anthropology course.

In addition, four special programs grew from teachers taking the Anthropology for Teachers course. A sociology and history teacher organized a "What is Human?" symposium at the Smithsonian Institution for forty-five selected high school students. Dr. Geza Teleki lectured on "Our Primate Relatives" and Dr. Kitty Brown talked about her fieldwork with the !Kung San (formerly called Bushmen). The students also engaged in 90 minute observation exercises in three National Museum of Natural History halls. The exercises were based, in part, on activities from the Anthropology for Teachers course. Another teacher started a project with his students excavating silt from the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal in Washington, D.C. In the process, the students uncovered many artifacts and created an exhibit at their school with the assistance of a Smithsonian Institution research fellow who guided the cataloguing and interpretation of the artifacts. (See Abell in this volume.) A third teacher wrote a field manual on archeology for high school students and successfully tested it with students during a summer archeology workshop. Finally, a teacher at Gallaudet College's Model Secondary School for the Deaf wrote a series of readings on human evolution to use with his students.

These educational benefits stem at least in part from teachers becoming excited about anthropology and about teaching and from their discovering ways to apply program material in their courses. Another result of the program has been the initial formation of a pre-college anthropology teachers association, generated by a 1981 reception and reunion for all

participants in the three years of the program. The initiation of this association and the expansion of the mailing list of Anthro·Notes demonstrate a growing network among pre-college teachers interested in anthropology.

Implications for the Anthropology Profession

Anthropologists must recognize that elementary, junior high, and high school teachers are interested in anthropology and are able to use the subject in their classes. A need exists for anthropologists to write textbooks and articles appropriate to secondary school students, but designing curriculum units and textbooks is not sufficient. Teachers need to learn enough anthropology so they will feel and be competent to incorporate it into their classes, and anthropologists, therefore, must design courses relevant to teachers--courses that do not now exist in most anthropology departments. A 1976 survey of teaching pre-collegiate anthropology concluded that

> preparation in anthropology...seems to be highly related to teaching anthropology... This finding should suggest anthropology departments be concerned with the inclusion of anthropology in teacher certification programs [Rice 1977:194].

Anthropologists need to seek out secondary teachers. Our teacher participants have been enthusiastic about the anthropologists they met, and the scholars who have talked at the Saturday seminars have been stimulated by the teachers. Several seminar speakers return year after year.

It is important that university and museum anthropologists make a commitment to secondary education in order for the discipline to grow. If students do not become interested in anthropology by the time they graduate from high school, they are less likely to take it as undergraduates. An interest in anthropology at the secondary level is an investment in enrolling more students in the subject at the college level. Anthropology departments in universities across the country need to spend part of their funds and energies on pre-collegiate anthropology.

If anthropologists can reach the secondary school audience, perhaps they can give anthropology the kind of prominence and acceptance in many areas of American life that have recently been achieved by other relative newcomers to secondary schools, such as psychology and economics. More importantly, by teaching anthropology in schools the value of anthropology in our multi-cultural world can be recognized and encouraged in all areas of public life.

NOTES

1. We are very grateful to the National Science Foundation for the funding of SPI78-04713, 1978-1979; SPI79-0155, 1979-1980; SPI80-00390, 1980-1981; and SPI81-01343, 1981-1982 as part of their Education Division's Pre-College Development in Sciences grant program.

2. Program staff: Dr. Alison S. Brooks, Project Director and Associate Professor of Anthropology, George Washington University, and Research Associate in Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution; JoAnne Lanouette, Instructor in Anthropology, George Washington University, and Collaborator, Department of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution; and Ruth O. Selig, Education Specialist, Department of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution, and Assistant Professorial Lecturer, George Washington University.

3. Saturday Seminar Speakers (1978-1981) include: Dr. Robert Humphrey, Dr. Suzanne Simons, Dr. Ruth Krufeld, Dr. R. Kepler Lewis, Dr. Victor Golla, Dr. Katherine Allen, and Dr. Alison Brooks from George Washington University; Dr. J. Lawrence Angel, Dr. T. Dale Steward, Dr. William Merrill, Dr. William Fitzhugh, Dr. Douglas Ubelaker, Dr. Priscilla Linn, and Ms. Amy Kotkin from the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Pamela Cressey, Director, Alexandria Archaeological Research Center; Dr. Eliot Liebow and Dr. Hal Vreeland, Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, National Institute of Mental Health; Dr. Mark Leone, University of Maryland; Dr. Brett Williams, American University; and Dr. Edward Lifschitz, Museum of African Art.

4. The results listed stem primarily from the approximately 105 teachers who took the course in 1978-1979 and 1979-1980; results are not yet in for 1980-1981.

REFERENCES CITED

Abell, Richard P.
1981 Teaching High School Anthropology. In Teaching Anthropology to Students and Teachers: Reaching a Wider Audience. Patricia J. Higgins and Ruth O. Selig, eds. Athens: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project.

Ferguson, Henry
1976 How Students Learn to Know Other Cultures. Christian Science Monitor, August 30, p. 25.

Rice, Marion J.
1977 Teaching Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: The Results of a Survey and Recommendations. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 8:193-195.

TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL ANTHROPOLOGY

Richard P. Abell
Walt Whitman High School
Bethesda, Maryland

I teach two courses, each a semester in length, one in cultural anthropology and the other a sequence of physical anthropology and archaeology. The contents of my courses in anthropology are probably not startingly different from the anthropology courses of many high school teachers. While I am happy to share the content of my courses, I believe it is more important to share what I believe should animate the high school course in anthropology. First, however, it is useful to describe the course content and methodology.

Course Content and Methodology

The one semester course in cultural anthropology presently contains five units. These five units do not provide a comprehensive survey of the field, but instead introduce high school juniors and seniors to five areas of great interest to students this age.

The first unit introduces students to the concept of culture, as well as other basic concepts, through reading and discussion of selected ethnographies such as Coming of Age in Samoa by Margaret Mead, The Forest People by Colin Turnbull, The Harmless People by Elizabeth Marshall Thomas, and Yanomamo: The Fierce People by Napoleon Chagnon. Since most students have never read such books before, this unit is commonly an eye-opening experience.

The second unit, Culture and the Human Life Cycle, is cross-cultural and requires that students conduct field studies in their own culture of various stages in the life cycle from pregnancy and childbirth to old age and death. The third unit is entitled Religion, Magic and Healing and provides students with a cross-cultural perspective of the supernatural and medicine. A field study of a modern religious institution is required. The fourth unit, Culture Change, focuses on the impact and responses of other cultures to Western imperialism, Western ethnocentrism, and Western industrialism.

The last unit provides students with an opportunity to view the modern world and our own society through the study of three ethnographies. Male-female relations in U.S. culture are examined through a comparative study of Women of the Forest by Yolanda and Robert Murphy. Poverty and racism are studied through a reading of Tally's Corner by Elliot Liebow. Cultural disintegration in America is considered through a view of the Ik in The Mountain People by Colin Turnbull.

The other course I teach has a nine-week segment devoted to physical anthropology and another nine weeks on archaeology. Brief units in physical anthropology are as follows: Human Design and Variation; Playing with Bones; Male and Female: Vive la Difference!; Our Primate Cousins; The Search for Human Origins; and Homo: Found at Last! Insofar as possible, students are given opportunities to experience and get their hands on the objects that physical anthropologists deal with. In school, a considerable amount of time is spent examining and studying human skeletal anatomy and analyzing fossil skulls. Students take a field trip to The Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History to study exhibits on human evolution, and to the National Zoo to conduct primate studies.

In archaeology, the nine weeks is divided into three units. The first is on archaeological methods during which students examine artifacts and data from a prehistoric site in Illinois, analyze them, develop inferences and test them, and finally write a description of the culture of the people who once inhabited the site. A second unit deals with dating techniques, ecological studies, lithic technology, and pottery technology. The last brief unit is on the prehistory of North America with particular reference to the eastern portion.

In archaeology, too, the field experience is important. With a bit of luck and some enterprise on the part of the teacher, field experiences can be found. Last spring we excavated a land-fill in nearby Prince George's County where the National Park Service had dumped 500 truck loads of dredgings from the C & O Canal in Georgetown. Students excavated some of the site and recovered thousands of artifacts. The laborious task of cleaning, sorting, and cataloguing followed. The many bottles found suggest that Georgetown residents must have drunk a lot more whiskey than milk! Type collections of bottles have been sent to four different museums.

Students this year had the experience of developing a small museum display for our school. One student commented as follows on this experience:

> Anyone can read out of books about the lives of past people, but to be able to dig up facts, hold them in your hands, and see them before your eyes is more learning than can be done through hours in the classroom. Maybe only half the bottles, coins, wagon wheels, and china will be valuable for museums, but it is valuable as a learning experience to us.

Critical Animating Features

Let us turn to the more important question: Since the subject matter of these courses can hardly be unique, what should animate high school anthropology courses? Four aspects of the courses described above have special importance and make the anthropological experience stand out in the mind of the high school student.

First of all, the courses are planned to be as interesting as possible for students being exposed to anthropology for the first time. The teacher tries to select the most fascinating, significant, and intriguing content units, readings, and activities. Who cares about kinship analysis? Certainly not most high school students. The high school course should be highly selective--not inclusive, not a survey course, not an introductory college course. A survey course at the high school level would require superficial treatment of everything. That is a sure path to boredom. For similar reasons, any textbook should be used sparingly if at all. Instead of a text, use collections of readings and reprints of interesting articles, as well as suitable ethnographies, written at a level that challenges but does not overwhelm the high school student. The high school course needs to whet the students' interests in the subject area, entice them into study, intrigue them with new ideas, involve them in the field, introduce them carefully to the exotic, and thereby compel them to wonder and awe, laugh and cry at what it means to be human.

It is not suggested that the high school course should entice young people into careers in anthropology, but it can certainly encourage them to take college level anthropology courses that are relevant to their lives and plans. College anthropology departments report a declining enrollment in anthropology courses and curricula in the 1979-80 academic year as compared with the 1978-79 year (American Anthropological Association 1980:1). With the sharp decline in the numbers of students high schools are now experiencing, colleges will soon feel the strong effects of declining enrollments. Academic anthropologists at the college level need to be deeply concerned with the high school course since it can be a significant influence on the anthropology course choices college students make. The American Anthropological Association should be involved with programs to stimulate interest in anthropology at the high school level, not only for their intrinsic value, but also as a means of attracting prospective undergraduate students to this fascinating and valuable subject area.

The second core feature that should animate the high school course is experiential learning. In cultural anthropology this means giving high school students opportunities to do field studies in their own society; in physical anthropology it means a chance to "play with bones" and conduct simple experiments in human variation and anatomy; and in archaeology it consists of the opportunity to go on archaeological digs and to do lab and museum work with artifactual materials. The teacher should be alert to opportunities for students in archaeological field schools. A number of my high school students have had extraordinarily fruitful experiences in field schools, particularly one run by Dr. R. Christopher Goodwin on

St. Kitts Island in the Caribbean and one run by Dr. William Gardner at Thunderbird in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia.

The third dynamic of the high school course is the anthropological view. The student must be exposed to the cultural relativism of anthropology, to its comparative way of looking at cultures, to its humanistic and scientific methods and concerns. While the high school course should not eschew the exotic, frequent comparisons need to be made with our own culture. One of the most helpful readings is Horace Miner's "Body Ritual Among the Nacirema" (1956) and student-conducted field studies should also delve into Nacirema culture. (Francis Hsu (1979:526) has recommended in this connection that graduate students in anthropology conduct studies in their own culture before undertaking field studies in some other culture.) The high school student should be able to say, at the conclusion: "This course has given me a new way to look at my culture."

The fourth, and last, dynamic that should animate the high school anthropology course is the attack on, and the subversion of, positive ethnocentrism. It should be a primary task of every anthropology teacher to neutalize students' ethnocentrism. Let me elaborate.

In his distinguished Presidential address to the AAA in 1978, Professor Hsu described two forms of ethnocentrism, one or the other of which is found in all cultures. Non-Western cultures, characterized by what Hsu calls neutral ethnocentrism, "tend to have no desire to change the ways of those whom they see as inferior or wrong" (Hsu 1979:522). Western cultures with positive ethnocentrism proselytize and attempt to change cultures regarded as inferior or wrong.

Most of us have been reared with a strong positive ethnocentrism. Coming as I do from WASP New England, I was reared with a particularly virulent form of positive ethnocentrism that epitomizes all of those assumptions of class and cultural superiority which this elite holds and which so endears members of it to one another and so offends everyone else. Of course my positive ethnocentrism is at war with my relativistic, rational, non-ethnocentric anthropological training.

This inner struggle, if present, can be used to advantage by a teacher. I still want to save the world, to meddle in the lives of others. But the target has changed. I now want to save the world from all those imperialists, colonialists, missionaries, racists, militarists, proselytizers, and politicians who, in their arrogant positive ethnocentrism, attempt to make the rest of the world behave according to American standards. The only way I can save the world from all those scoundrels is through my teaching. The high school teacher must be the passionate humanist in a classroom full of students whose positive ethnocentrism needs to be converted to the neutral form.

The students we teach in high school are, as Erik Erikson noted, at a stage where they are particularly idealistic; "it is the ideological potential of a society which speaks most clearly to the adolescent who is so

eager to be affirmed by peers, to be confirmed by teachers, and to be inspired by worthwhile 'ways of life'" (Erikson 1968:30). In a world where the forces of human love and concern seem to be in precarious balance with the forces of fratricide and chaos we teachers must "bear personal witness to the reality of anthropology as a vital and potent contemporary path to meaningful existence" (Grindal et al. 1980:4). In this way we make our lives and our courses an inspiration to the young men and women we teach.

REFERENCES CITED

American Anthropological Association
1980 Departments Report Declining Enrollment. Anthropology Newsletter 21(8):1.

Erikson, Erik H.
1968 Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton.

Grindal, Bruce, et al.
1980 Humanistic Anthropology: A Perspective on Being Human. Anthropology Newsletter 21(8):4.

Hsu, Francis L.K.
1979 The Cultural Problem of the Cultural Anthropologist. American Anthropologist 81:517-532.

Miner, Horace
1956 Body Ritual Among the Nacirema. American Anthropologist 58:503-507.

NOTES ON HIGH SCHOOL FIELDWORK

Beatrice Spencer Kleppner
Beaver County Day School
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

For many teachers of anthropology, and certainly for this one, fieldwork has irresistible attractions. A successful project can be intellectually rewarding for teacher as well as student, and it can generate an enthusiasm and engagement which is hard to inspire in the classroom. Over the years I have conducted numerous field projects, but much as I would like to formulate a set of general principles, I simply cannot. The projects have each been different--not, I must confess, as a matter of principle but as a matter of personal taste. Nonetheless, there are some considerations which guide my planning, and perhaps these are worth noting.

Intellectual Focus

Fieldwork is almost invariably exciting and attractive to students. Teachers, too, relish the occasion to leave classroom and school, to live in exotic surroundings (a trip to a Black community in Bermuda comes to mind) or to play unusual roles (as we did for a week one winter when we played Pilgrim, costumes and all). The fellowship of living together and working for a common goal generates a comraderie which adds a valuable dimension to the class and to the school. These elements alone can provide a sufficient rationale for fieldwork, but for me the first consideration has to be whether the project makes sense in terms of the academic goals of the course. The issue is by no means straightforward, for my field projects generally grow from opportunity and circumstance; they are rarely premeditated.

Our Pilgrim escapade, for example, was launched more or less spontaneously during a class visit to the Plimouth Plantation, a recreation of the 1620 colony. The idea of living together in one of the cottages was suggested by a painfully shy student. The idea caught fire with her classmates and with the Plantation staff, but I was concerned about how to elevate the venture above a simple week of masquerading and living in the rough. In this case the problem was easily solved. The Plimoth colony is well documented, and my class immersed itself in the literature. Governor Bradford's diary was an invaluable resource. When it came time to start our sojourn we had a reasonable knowledge of the personalities of the original colony, their

way of life, their resources and their concerns. Jim Deetz, then archeological director of the Plantation, took us under his wing, guiding our studies and providing access to the staff and the resources of the Plantation. The project developed into a highly structured exercise in colonial history and archeology. And it was also a memorable escapade.

A somewhat more traditional field project involved excavating a colonial cellar hole on Prudence Island, Rhode Island. The site was on some ancestral land owned by a faculty colleague. We had carte blanche to pitch camp on the island and excavate the site. The opportunity to camp on a beautiful island for a week naturally generated immediate enthusiasm from the class. I was reluctant to lead the dig, however, for though I have done graduate work in archeology and have participated in numerous digs, I am not a professional. To give a stronger intellectual focus to the project, I contacted Ann Yentch, a colonial archeologist at Brown University, who agreed to supervise the dig. The class learned a great deal about archeological technique, and the dig was professionally documented and reported. As a preliminary to the dig we made two trips to Rhode Island courthouses where the class worked with archibal documents, for continuous records of the island extend back to pre-Revolutionary times.

Both of these projects grew spontaneously, and in each case the intellectual framework was imposed after the project was conceived. I do not feel that this is actually a bad way to proceed. In fact, I am not sure how I could conceive a field project in the abstract. If there is any moral to this it is: Grab the opportunity and make it fit your goals. This may be putting the cart before the horse, but it seems to work.

Ethical Problems

By its very nature, anthropological fieldwork tends to create ethical dilemmas. The fact that the field project is at the high school level does not seem to matter, and problems occur surprisingly often. A student working in a gas station to gather material for an ethnographic profile is initiated into the ways to cheat customers and the boss. An observer in a day care center finds herself recording pathological behavior of a parent. A student studying a high school lounge witnesses serious drug selling.

Responding to such problems with integrity and tact is a perplexing task. I have learned, however, that students are in a much better position to deal with ethical problems if they have been forewarned. I now introduce fieldwork by posing a series of ethical case studies to the class. It does not take long to accumulate a collection of one's own.

Reciprocity can also be a problem. My field projects invariably depend on the assistance of strangers. Anthropologists, archeologists, primatologists, zoo keepers, school teachers, authors and all sorts of professionals have helped me at one time or another. The class ought to reciprocate their help, though usually this is impossible. Occasionally the field project can be reciprocal. Our visit to Bermuda, and a visit to French-speaking Canada, were followed up by exchange visits to our school.

And sometimes one finds an opportunity to say thanks in a special way. One afternoon of our Prudence Island venture was spent clearing land for our hosts.

Complications and Unpleasant Surprises

Fieldwork with high school students is not for the timid. One worries about the usual logistical problems--clothing, food, transportation, medical resources--but the unexpected invariably occurs. A student complains about her host family. I tell her to buck up and adjust. It turns out that the host mother is having her annual nervous breakdown. I rush to extricate my student, but she says not to worry. She has bucked up and adjusted. She can handle everything. I leave her to it, but I worry. A boyfriend flies to a field site and attempts to perpetrate an elopement. I patiently explain to him our academic goals. He departs gracelessly. We are returning south to Boston. Our bus driver gets confused and takes off toward Alaska. He speaks no English and understands no signs. It is 3 AM at the airport and all my students save one have long ago been picked up. She awaits her aunt. I await her aunt.

Fortunately, the horrors of the moment become tomorrow's cheerful anecdotes.

Is It Worth It?

Fieldwork's very popularity makes it hard to evaluate the results objectively. Any project which requires extraordinary effort from the staff and takes the students out of the school, possibly interfering with their other studies, should provide a substantial return. At the very least, my students learn something about orderly reporting, for each one keeps a journal. Occasionally the journal provides the raw material for a substantial paper.

Beyond this immediate return, it is difficult to assess the potential value of a project. The payoff may not come for years, if ever. Possibly my field projects have contributed to the fact that several of my former students are now practicing anthropologists while a number of others are in graduate school. One has become a well known ethnographic photographer. Students that I had viewed as disengaged or frivolous have told me years later that some incident in their fieldwork had resonances in college which affected their careers. A few such episodes seem enough to make it all worthwhile.

Success generally brings problems, and this certainly is true for successful dieldwork. Each new class is fired by stories, usually exaggerated, of former trips. Some years, however, must be fallow. The students are disappointed and the school may feel let down. And the bonds that develop between student and teacher can sometimes chafe. It is midsummer. An old student calls. She has graduated from college. I am pleased. She had majored in anthropology. I am delighted. She chose anthropology because

of a fieldtrip with me. I am enchanted. She can not find a job and expects me to get her one. I am speechless.

INNOVATION AND RESPONSE: PROJECT CREATIVE IN ANTHROPOLOGY AT AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Mario D. Zamora
Raquel M. German
College of William and Mary

Since 1977 the senior author has been conducting an experiment in the transmission of anthropological knowledge to students in introductory courses of cultural anthropology at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. It is appropriate to begin by explaining the background and rationale behind this experiment.

Serious concern has time and again been expressed by educators, administrators, and students, from the United States and abroad, about the adverse effect of large classes on the quality, integrity, and climate of scholarship in introductory courses in the social sciences. Professors and students alike seem to note a certain degree of dissatisfaction with the status quo. The atmosphere in these classes appears impersonal, detached, and business-like. Little social interaction exists among students or between the professor and his students.

The usual activities under this "traditional" system are lectures, highly standardized objective tests, and film sessions or some resource person now and then to break the routine. For the most part, lectures dominate the scene in these large introductory classes, and this may become an insipid method when it fails to stimulate discussion in an impersonal audience. Some financially able departments employ teaching assistants to conduct discussion sessions with groups of students, or student assistants to ease the professor's load in correcting objective exams.

For four years the senior author strictly followed the procedures outlined above in his teaching of anthropology. In a serious effort to vary his teaching techniques he made an informal survey of students' opinions on the traditional method. From this unstructured investigation, he gathered that students were disappointed and dissatisfied with the traditional method which seemed to them a dull routine in need of innovation.

Purposes of Project Creative

To counter the disadvantages of the traditional lecture method and large class sizes, the senior author designed and implemented Project Creative. The basic objective of Project Creative is to enable students to conceptualize main ideas and vividly illustrate them in some concrete and graphic form through personal involvement in planned skits, dramas, debates, festivals, etc. It was hoped that students would enjoy themselves in the process and make healthy and meaningful associations and friendships with other human beings. Through personal involvement in the illustration of ideas, it was expected that students would remember and retain the main concepts, principles, and generalizations in cultural anthropology. Students in Project Creative were given the opportunity to innovate, visualize, and objectively evaluate their experiences.

In summary, CREATIVE means:

1) CONCEPTUALIZATION: to develop in students the ability to identify fundamental ideas of the textbook and other materials and the ability to illustrate them properly in class presentations.

2) REMEMBERING: to foster the retention of fundamental ideas through the concrete behavioral and personal involvement of students.

3) ENJOYMENT: to enable students to enjoy and appreciate learning by enhancing better comprehension and by minimizing unnecessary stresses or tensions in the learning environment.

4) ASSOCIATION: to enhance learning through meaningful social interaction in a small group situation within a large class.

5) TRANSFORMATION: to create an atmosphere of drama, interest, and excitement that will transform the classroom into a colorful venue for learning and remembering.

6) INNOVATION: to cultivate in the student the capacity to think creatively.

7) VISUALIZATION: to utilize material resources which best illustrate major ideas.

8) EVALUATION: to enhance critical thinking and the learning process by offering students the opportunity to critically assess human experiences.

Process

During the first two weeks of each semester, the rationale behind Project Creative was explained to students, and a syllabus outlining its aims and procedures was provided (see Appendix A). The class was then divided into sixteen groups of approximately ten students each.

Each group had an informal conference with the professor to discuss the group's major topic of interest in cultural anthropology and to consider ways to illustrate it instructively. These discussion conferences, set at a mutually convenient time, lasted up to two hours and were often held at the university cafeteria over coffee. It was an opportunity for more individualized attention and a chance to learn in a small group situation. On the average, the professor spent more than 100 hours beyond the prescribed class time in these discussion conferences, helping students to think critically and encouraging their creativity.

Apart from these discussion conferences with the professor, each group held its own meetings and the group leader kept the professor informed about the final theme and program of presentation. During the last weeks of the semester, each group had a turn to present its project, ranging from skits to sociodrama, illustrating the text and reading materials. Consolidated written reports or summaries of their presentations were required of the sixteen groups at the end of the semester.

This group project was only one of the course requirements, and not the sole basis for evaluation of student performance. Other means of evaluation were one take-home essay, one mid-term and one final exam. In the interim, the professor delivered lectures, showed films, and invited resource persons to diversify and complement learning.

Product: Findings and Analysis

The students' evaluation of Project Creative was ascertained through a questionnaire. The survey population consisted of the students enrolled in Anthropology 202-3, spring semester 1980, at The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. We distributed 179 questionnaires and obtained a response rate of 87 percent (155). Of the 155 respondents, 46 percent (72) were male and 54 percent (83) were female; 60 percent (93) were underclass (freshmen and sophomores) and 40 percent (62) were upperclass (juniors and seniors).

The questionnaire, devised by Dr. Zamora, consisted of eight questions, one each on the eight tasks of Project CREATIVE (Conceptualization, Remembering, Enjoyment, Association, Transformation, Innovation, Visualization, Evaluation) which have been previously defined. Students were asked to judge the success of Project Creative with respect to each of these tasks. Each of the eight questions had three answer categories, which were assigned a value (thorough=2, fair=1, nil=0) for scoring purposes.

In Table 1 (see Appendix B) the mean scores of both male and female respondents rate the overall success of Project Creative as between "fair" and "thorough," but closer to "fair." Male respondents rated the success of Project Creative slightly higher than female respondents. It is important to remark here that a wide range of opinion was present in rating Project Creative's success. Female respondents tended to rate lower but also to display the widest range of disagreement.

Tables 2 and 3 show almost no difference in terms of sex and class on how students viewed Project Creative. A bare majority of students viewed Project Creative as thoroughly successful, while a very small minority (in most cases less than five percent) viewed Project Creative as not successful at all. Still, a sizable number of students (46%) viewed Project Creative as only fairly successful, which leads us to conclude that this teaching method may need some modifications to improve its success ratings.

Table 4 shows the eight tasks Project Creative set out to accomplish and the success ratings for each of these. In three areas (enjoyment, innovation, and evaluation), Project Creative showed remarkable success. Enjoyment ($\bar{X}$= 1.72) was the task more thoroughly accomplished by Project Creative, followed closely by innovation ($\bar{X}$= 1.65) and evaluation ($\bar{X}$= 1.62). The other five less successful areas may need some improvement. Remembering and conceptualization ranked the lowest, but still had slightly above "fair" ratings. It would be useful to compare students' ratings of other teaching methods in terms of these same tasks.

Tables 5 and 6 show a rather high attendance rate to the oral presentations, which were an integral part and culminating event of Project Creative. Female respondents had a significantly higher attendance rate than male respondents, but class did not have as significant an impact on attendance rates. The validity of the response categories used ("more than half," "less than half," and "none") may be questionable. Less broad and ambiguous response categories (such as an ordinal scale of "up to 25%," "up to 50%," and "up to 75%") would more adequately reflect the actual range of attendance rates. Also, Likert response categories (instead of the response categories "thorough," "fair," "nil," used in the previously discussed section of the questionnaire) would probably more accurately reflect students' opinions on the success of Project Creative.

Students were invited to jot down any comments about Project Creative at the end of the questionnaire. Of the 155 students in our sample, 43 percent (67) offered their comments. Table 7 presents the nature of these comments. Of the students who commented, slightly over half offered only positive comments, while one fourth offered only negative comments. Approximately another fourth offered a mixture of positive and negative comments.

The recurrent themes of the positive comments were that the group presentations were enjoyable, fun learning, and creative, and that they promoted social involvement. The recurrent themes of the negative comments were that the group presentations were merely entertaining and not instructive, that some group members did all the work and it was unfair that all members received the same grade, that the groups were too large, and finally that presentations lacked specific guidelines to make them really instructive. Nevertheless, students were favorably impressed overall by Project Creative; whether this is a function of its novelty (and will wear off after longer exposure) and not its intrinsic value, we will have to wait to see.

In conclusion, we can say that Project Creative did have a positive impact upon the teaching of anthropology at William and Mary. Nonetheless, it is consistently illustrated in our findings that there is still room for improvement in this innovative teaching approach.

Problems

From the viewpoint of the professor, the main problem in this teaching approach is the investment of time beyond the prescribed class meetings. Another problem concerns the background, quality, seriousness, and cooperation of students needed to insure greater learning from this approach. And finally, an improved version of the questionnaire would help us to more accurately capture the viewpoints of students to better assess the value of Project Creative.

Concluding Remarks

The experiment titled Project Creative is an ongoing process. Student responses reveal points of weakness and strength. Based on students' findings and recommendations, the authors hope to critically review the project and perhaps modify some of its techniques. The authors also plan to employ a more systematic and vivid way of recording the experiment. Perhaps the use of videotape and outside observers would be helpful in assessing what needs to be changed.

Interested colleagues from other universities facing the same dilemma, could perhaps test and replicate Project Creative for comparative purposes. Professor Zeus A. Salazar of the University of the Philippines has implemented a similar version of Project Creative and attained very positive results.[2]

While there can be no exact replication of Project Creative due to differing contexts, content, coverage, personnel, and processes, the general guidelines and contours of Project Creative may be relevant and meaningful to other interested professors and students of anthropology and related disciplines.

Project Creative has been a satisfying yet challenging experience for the senior author. There are serious problems still to be confronted. We hope, however, that this experiment can be a modest beginning to seek new ways of teaching and learning.

NOTES

1. The section on "Product: Findings and Analysis" was written by Ms. German; other portions of the paper were prepared by Dr. Zamora. The authors thank the faculty of the College of William and Mary's Department of Anthropology for their tolerance and cooperation and also Hallet German, student of cultural anthropology (1977-1980), and Ruth Selig of the Smithsonian Institution and the American Anthropological Association who gave us a forum to discuss the results of this experiment. The senior author also wishes to thank Nancy Gonzales (University of Maryland) and Sylvia Forman (University of Massachussetts) for sharing information with us. Finally, we are grateful to Dorian Patrizia Baroni (Dr. Zamora's teaching assistant, 1979-1981) whose assitance in crucial moments and sustained inspiration and cooperation made the experiment possible.

2. For further information write to Dr. Zeus A. Salazar, Department of History, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

APPENDIX A

GROUP PROJECTS IN ANTHROPOLOGY: GUIDELINES

Mario D. Zamora, Professor

1. Major aims: The class is divided into 16 groups to achieve the following: 1) to present programs illustrating fundamental principles of anthropology embodied in the text and other readings in substantive and concrete form. The oral presentation may take the form of a skit, a sociodrama, a slide session, or a debate, among others; the content and method of presentation will be left to the judgement and resourcefulness of each group; 2) to prepare a consolidated written report on the theme or topic based on the written contribution of each member of the group. The report may range from 12 pages in length to not more than 100 pages; 3) to serve as discussion groups on topics of a controversial nature; and 4) to get a chance to know one another in class, despite the "big" class size.

2. Criteria for grading: The oral presentations as well as the written reports will be graded on the basis of (a) originality, (b) human interest, (c) nature and quality of content, (d) effort, organization, and coordination of the group, and (e) punctuality and format. The oral/written reports will be equivalent to one "big" examination, along with the mid-term and the final tests.

3. Date/time of presentations: Please consult the syllabus for the groups' oral presentations. (The consolidated written reports are due on the last day of classes.)

4. Consultation with professor: The group leaders and members are invited to have coffee with Professor Zamora at the Wig on convenient times and dates. Please make your appointment early with Progessor Zamora to avoid cramming. Thank you.

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS

TABLE 1

TOTAL MEANS, VARIANCES, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF COMPOSITE SCORES BY SEX OF RESPONDENT

	Male	Female	Total
Mean*	11.64	11.49	11.56
Variance	6.57	9.77	8.24
Standard Deviation	2.56	3.13	2.87

*The number of questions (8) multiplied by the assigned value of the applicable answer category (thorough=2; fair=1; nil=0) gives the ideal mean score for each level of success of Project Creative, viz.; thorough success=16; fair success=8; no success=0.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF MEAN RESPONSES PER ANSWER CATEGORY BY SEX OF RESPONDENT*

Answer Category:	Male	Female	Total
Thorough	51% (37)	50% (41)	50% (78)
Fair	46% (33)	45% (38)	46% (71)
Nil	3% (2)	5% (4)	4% (6)
Total	100% (72)	100% (83)	100% (155)

*Each answer category rates the level of success of Project Creative.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF MEAN RESPONSES PER ANSWER CATEGORY BY CLASS OF RESPONDENT*

Answer Category:	Underclass	Upperclass	Total
Thorough	51% (47)	50% (31)	50% (78)
Fair	45% (42)	47% (29)	46% (71)
Nil	4% (4)	3% (2)	4% (6)
Total	100% (93)	100% (62)	100% (155)

*Each answer category rates the level of success of Project Creative.

TABLE 4

MEAN RESPONSES PER QUESTION BY SEX OF RESPONDENT*

Question:	Male	Female	Total
Conceptualization	1.32	1.31	1.32
Remembering	1.25	.99	1.11
Enjoyment	1.75	1.69	1.72
Association	1.38	1.47	1.43
Transformation	1.47	1.39	1.43
Innovation	1.61	1.69	1.65
Visualization	1.42	1.39	1.40
Evaluation	1.65	1.59	1.62

*Criterion for thorough success=2, for fair success=1, and for no success=0.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ATTENDANCE TO ORAL PRESENTATIONS BY SEX OF RESPONDENT

Presentations Attended:	Male	Female	Total
More than ½	79% (57)	87% (72)	83% (129)
Less than ½	21% (15)	13% (11)	17% (26)
Total	100% (72)	100% (83)	100% (155)

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ATTENDANCE TO ORAL PRESENTATIONS BY CLASS OF RESPONDENT

Presentations Attended:	Underclass	Upperclass	Total
More than ½	82% (76)	85% (53)	83% (129)
Less than ½	18% (17)	15% (9)	17% (26)
Total	100% (93)	100% (62)	100% (155)

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF COMMENTS OFFERED BY STUDENTS CONCERNING PROJECT CREATIVE

Positive	51% (34)
Negative	24% (16)
Negative and Positive	21% (14)
Neutral	4% (3)
Total	100% (67)

INDIANS, SOLDIERS, REDNECKS, AND PRISONERS: TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE OUTREACH CENTERS

Dennis E. Shaw
Miami-Dade Community College

Teaching anthropology at college outreach centers offers a set of unique teaching situations. Most outreach centers have constituents that are not characteristic of the total college student body, and these students bring their own cultural perspective to the classroom. This paper examines the peculiar circumstances involved in teaching anthropology at four different outreach centers of Miami-Dade Community College.

Miami-Dade Community College serves all of Dade County, Florida. There are four campuses with a Fall 1980 enrollment of 42,543. South Campus, the largest, has an enrollment of 16,869 which is 44.9% White non-Hispanic, 46.8% Hispanic, and 6.1% Black non-Hispanic. There are also students from over 50 foreign countries, more than any 2 or 4 year college in the United States. Each campus has outreach centers for specific target populations which are individually different from one another. South Campus had a Fall 1980 enrollment of 1200 in its outreach centers. This total does not include those enrolled in continuing education or non-credit courses.

Miccosukee Indian Tribe of Florida Tribal Headquarters

Teaching anthropology to a class of Indians living on a reservation offers many challenges. They practice many of the things that we teach, and an approach must be taken using the Indian's own cultural frame of reference as the starting point. Anthropology is generally taught by comparing other cultures to our own. In teaching Miccosukees, one must have some familiarity with their cultural and historical background in order to relate examples to them. One does not need to dwell too long, for example, on unilineal descent and kin groups since the Miccosukees are matrilineal and residually matrilocal, there being a recent trend towards bilocality. They are interested in other Indian groups, and want to know how they relate to them culturally and historically. Cross cultural questions and comparisons are almost always geared towards other Indian tribes throughout the United States. The Miccosukees are seemingly more fascinated by an explanation of the potlatch than are non-Indian students.

Since an introductory anthropology course is not meant to be a course on Native Americans, other cross-cultural examples are used. This is done best through audio-visual materials. The Miccosukees particularly enjoy "The Hunters" and "Dead Birds." They tend to ask more questions about these films than do non-Indian students and do not smirk, laugh, or retch at the killing of a giraffe or other examples of blood letting. They are quick to understand and employ cultural relativism in cross-cultural comparisons of aboriginal peoples around the world. Ethnocentrism is keen, however, when it comes to comparing Miccosukee culture with that of greater Miami. There is no doubt that they feel that their way is better than ours.

An area where the Miccosukees do defer to the dominant society, however, is in the realm of technology. Cars, motorcycles, airboats, televisions, and sewing machines are well evidenced among the tribe. This acceptance opens the door for a discussion of cultural change, but this must be done with great care. Once the Miccosukees feel that they are being "studied," any rapport that has been gained may be quickly lost. Acculturation is explained, but the students are never told "you are acculturated." Most are acculturated in varying degrees, but virtually none, with two or three possible exceptions, are assimilated.

The topic that sparks the greatest interest and discussion among the Miccosukees is fossil man. This was surprising to me since, as an archaeologist, I am keenly aware of the problems involved in confronting Indians with skeletons. For this reason, I asked them in advance if they would like me to bring a human skull and casts of fossil man. Once they realized that none of the fossil material was from the New World, they were quite eager. This presentation led to the most questions and best discussion of the entire semester. They examined the skulls closely and demonstrated no hesitation in handling them.

The cultural perspective of the Miccosukees also necessitates alternative teaching strategies. Group discussion is all but impossible to stimulate and instructor-student eye contact non-existent. One has to become accustomed to teaching a class in which every student is looking down, up, or to one side. Punctuality is unheard of and attendance is sporadic.

Homestead Air Force Base

Teaching anthropology on a military installation offers another set of circumstances. Many of the students are career military and have vast amounts of experience with other cultures. Some of the students are military dependents who have had prolonged exposure to other cultures. The students are quite able to provide cross-cultural examples of the topics presented in class. Military students seem to more easily grasp the importance of cultural differences and similarities and recognize the significance of cultural relativism.

Homestead Air Force Base is the location of the Air Force's Sea Survival School. The Survival School instructors are required to complete all of the survival schools (sea, arctic, desert, and jungle) before they

become an instructor. Several of these instructors have taken anthropology on base, and the knowledge and experience they have acquired in survival school can be utilized in the anthropology classes.

For example, Jungle Survival School is located in the Philippines, and each student there is assigned a Philippine Negrito as a personal instructor. The goal is that each student will know as much about jungle survival as the Negritos by the time his training is over. While such a goal may be short-sighted, the students do complete the program with an excellent background in jungle survival and a close personal knowledge of Negrito culture. Most survival instructors are senior non-commissioned officers with leadership experience, and are quite willing to give class presentations on Negrito culture. My classes at Homestead Air Force Base have included demonstrations of blowguns, traps, and bows and arrows, all brought back from the Philippines by survival instructors.

Military students also perform the best scholastically. My Homestead Air Force Base classes consistently have more "A"s and "B"s and fewer "D"s and "F"s than other classes on or off campus.

A Rural Southern Outreach Center

The students attending college classes at South Dade High School are, in many ways, the opposite of those at the military base. South Dade High School serves the city of Homestead, Florida, and outlying rural areas. The area is characterized by conservatism, both politically and culturally. Ethnocentrism is very strong, and the students seem more ready to employ it than they do cultural relativism. While part of this is due to general Southern conservatism, a great deal of it is fostered by a backlash against the large Cuban community in South Florida. Common bumper stickers in South Dade read "I'm a Native American...An Endangered Species," and "Next Time You Complain About a Farmer Don't Talk With Your Mouth Full."

Cultural differences seem to be "strange" to many of these students, and, even though many do well in the course, most appear to leave with much the same attitudes and preconceptions they had when they entered. They may be able to explain the difference between ethnocentrism and cultural relativism or do well at cross-cultural comparisons, but they do not display any noticeable appreciation for cultural differences. Most students still see cultural diversity as a collection of strange and bizarre behaviors which do not measure up to the good old U.S.A. I always look at these classes as a challenge and continually try to think of new ways to emphasize the role of cultural relativism in my lectures.

South Dade Federal Correctional Institute

While the South Dade Federal Correctional Institute is a nice, new medium security facility, it is still a prison. Teaching there is not like teaching anywhere else. Every movement is regulated by bells, and the loudspeaker regularly blasts out orders and instructions. At least 10-15 minutes

is lost out of every hour of class due to announcements on the loudspeaker. This also plays havoc with any films in progress. The students don't seem to mind because they are used to the constant orders and announcements. For the instructor, however, it is often difficult to keep a train of thought.

A class of prisoners is literally a captive audience. No one is late to class and no one is absent except in case of substantiated illness. While many students are there simply to kill time or get out of work, quite a few are very serious and perform very well. The serious students are eager to learn about anthropology and the disinterested students could care less. While this applies in any class, it is more pronounced in the prison. The better students tend to be the best of any class, and the poor students among the poorest of any teaching experience. Whether they are serious or not, most prison students are attentive and courteous. This is due in large part to the fact that disruptive students are not allowed to stay in class.

There are few choices of classes in the prison so the students take what is available. Most, therefore, take anthropology by default. Their reception of the course, however, is good. The cultural experience of the prison has already conditioned these students to the realities of cultural diversity. Moreover, prison life has a culture all its own, and the students see very early in the course the relevance of anthropology for them. The focal point for cross-cultural comparison in this class becomes the prison.

Perhaps the reason why some prisoners excell as students is because they have the time to spend on their studies. There is nothing particularly special about the excellent prison student in anthropology. Those who do well in one class tend to do well in all of their classes. Many have told me, however, that anthropology was the most interesting, informative, and relevant class that they have had in their prison experience.

Conclusion

As these examples illustrate, teaching at an outreach center is not the same as teaching on campus. Besides the wide diversity of facilities, the constituency affects the direction that the anthropology course will take. Each outreach group brings its own cultural perspective and its own uniqueness, and each adds to the instructor's understanding and appreciation of diversity in human cultures.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY: A BEGINNING GUIDE TO RESOURCES ON PRE-COLLEGIATE ANTHROPOLOGY

Compiled by
Ruth O. Selig

Bibliographies

Burnett, Jacquetta H.
1974 Anthropology and Education: An Annotated Bibliographic Guide. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.

Dwyer-Schick, Susan
1976 The Study and Teaching of Anthropology: An Annotated Bibliography. Athens: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project.

Gallagher, James J.
1967 An Annotated Bibliography of Anthropological Materials for High School Use. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Storey, Edward, ed.
1971 Anthropology and Education: A General Bibliography. Atlanta: Department of Anthropology, Georgia State University.

Books and Articles

Anthropology Curriculum Study Project
1972 Students and Teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Asch, Timothy
1975 Using Film in Teaching Anthropology: One Pedagogical Approach. In Principles of Visual Anthropology. Paul Hockings, ed. pp. 385-420. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, with distribution in the United States by Aldine, Chicago.

Bailey, Wilfrid C.
1973 Anthropology in Schools. In Anthropology Beyond the University. Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings, No. 7. Alden Redfield, ed. pp. 68-78. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Bohannan, Paul, et al.
1969 Experimental Ninth Grade Anthropology Course. American Anthropologist 71:409-420.

Charles, C.L.
1972 Anthropology Curriculum Study Project: Patterns in Human History. Social Education 36:724-726.

Chilcott, John H.
1962 A Proposal for the Unification of Secondary School Courses Through Anthropology. Clearing House 36:387-393.
1977 Curriculum Models for Teaching Anthropology. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 3:14-18.

Collier, Malcolm
1963 Report on the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project. The Indiana Social Studies Quarterly 16(1):10-15.
1971 Anthropology in the Schools. In The Encyclopedia of Education, Lee C. Deighton, ed. Vol. 1. pp. 228-232. New York: The Macmillan Company and the Free Press.

Collier, Malcolm, and Edwin S. Dethlefsen
1968 Anthropology in the Pre-Collegiate Curriculum. Human Organization 27:11-16.

Collins, John J.
1975 Some Applications of Anthropology in an Interdisciplinary Program. Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly 6:39-41.

Cotter, John L.
1979 Archaeologists of the Future: High Schools Discover Archaeology. Archaeology 32(1):29-35.

Comitas, Lambros, and Janet Dolgin
1978 On Anthropology and Education: Retrospect and Prospect. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 9:165-180.

Crane, Julia G., and Michael V. Angrosino
1974 Field Projects in Anthropology: A Student Handbook. Morristown: General Learning Press.

de Borhegyi, S.F.
1969 New Role for Anthropology in the Natural History Museum. Current Anthropology 10:368-370.

Dynneson, Thomas L.
1975 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials. Athens: University of Georgia, Anthropology Curriculum Project.

Eddy, Elizabeth M.
1968 Anthropology and Teacher Education. Human Organization 27:17-20.

Ellison, Jack
1960 Anthropology Brings Human Nature into The Classroom. Social Education 24:313-316,328.

Fallers, M.C., ed.
1968 Anthropology: Introduction. Social Education 32:105-106. (Special issue devoted to anthropological concepts and methods for teachers.)

Fenton, Edwin, ed.
1967 Teaching the New Social Studies: An Inductive Approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Gearing, Frederick O., ed.
1970 Toward a Mankind Curriculum: From Kindergarten Through Twelfth Grade. Today's Education 59:28-30.

Heider, Karl
1977 Films for Anthropology Teaching. 6th ed. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Hunter, David, and Mary Ann Foley
1976 Doing Anthropology. New York: Harper and Row.

Ianni, Francis A.J., and Edward Storey, eds.
1973 Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues: Readings in Anthropology and Education. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Kimball, Solon T.
1965 Anthropology and Teacher Training. In Five Fields and Teacher Education. D.B. Gowin and C. Richardson, eds. pp. 1-11. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Lindquist, Lawrence W.
1968 The Civic Responsibility of Anthropologists to Public Education. Human Organization 27:1-4.

Littleford, M.S.
1973 Teaching Anthropological Processes and Perspectives in the Secondary School. High School Journal 56:207-216.

Lundstrum, John P.
1968 Anthropology Pre-Service Teacher Education and Certification. Social Education 32:135-141.

Mandelbaum, David G., Gabriel W. Laker, and Ethel M. Albert, eds.
1963 Resources for the Teaching of Anthropology. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1963 The Teaching of Anthropology. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, Memoir 94.

National Council for Social Studies
1972 New In-Depth Evaluation of Social Studies Curricular Projects, Programs, and Materials. Social Education 36:711-773.

Naylar, Larry L.
1977 Anthropology Today for the Anthropologist of Tomorrow. American Anthropologist 79:618-629.

Rice, Marion J., and Wilfrid C. Bailey
1971 Final Report: The Development of a Sequential Curriculum in Anthropology, Grades 1-7. Athens: University of Georgia.

Roberts, Joan I., and Sherri K. Akinsanya, eds.
1976 Educational Patterns and Cultural Configurations: The Anthropology of Education. New York: D. McKay Company.

Spindler, George D.
1955 Anthropology and Education: An Overview. In Education and Anthropology. George D. Spindler, ed. pp. 5-37. Stanford University Press.

Spindler, George D., ed.
1974 Education and Cultural Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Stern, Adele
1974 Converging Paths of Humanity: Approaches and Materials for Studying Anthropology. Media and Methods 11:43-45.

Wax, Murray L., Stanley Diamond, and Frederick O. Gearing, eds.
1971 Anthropological Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Periodicals

Anthro·Notes: A Newsletter for Teachers. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution. (G.W.U./S.I. Anthropology for Teachers Program, NSF Funding.)

Anthropology and Education Quarterly. Washington, DC: Council on Anthropology and Education.

Social Education. Washington, DC: National Council for The Social Studies.

CONTRIBUTORS

Richard P. Abell
Walt Whitman High School
3513 Livingston St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20015

Alison S. Brooks
Department of Anthropology
George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20052

Thomas L. Dynneson
University of Texas, Permian Basin
Odessa, Texas 79762

Raquel M. German
Department of Sociology
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Patricia J. Higgins
Department of Anthropology
State University of New York
Plattsburgh, New York 12901

Beatrice S. Kleppner
Beaver Country Day School
19 Beatrice Circle
Belmont, Massachussetts 02178

JoAnne Lanouette
Department of Anthropology
George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20052

Ruth O. Selig
Department of Anthropology
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560

Dennis Shaw
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Miami-Dade Community College
11011 Southwest 104th St.
Miami, Florida 33176

Mario D. Zamora
Department of Anthropology
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185